Boston Public Library
3 9999 10522 713 4

PER. RM.

№* AP2.N7

V.153

1891

THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

RE-ESTABLISHED BY ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

EDITED BY LLOYD BRYCE.

1901-1
V. 153

VOL. CLIII.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

NEW YORK:
No. 3 EAST FOURTEENTH STREET.
1891.

NOV 10 1964

Per Dept
AP2
N7
Vol 153

3/21/12
1 v.
Dor.
+82.1.153
X6460

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE.

All rights reserved.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

DORCHESTER BRANCH
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXVI.

JULY, 1891.

MY VIEWS ON PHILANTHROPY.

BY THE BARON DE HIRSCH.

I HAVE followed with lively interest the series of articles on the "Obligations of Wealth," which have appeared in the well-known NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and although I am more a man of deeds than of word or pen, I am quite ready to answer, so far as practicable, the question asked me as to "what motives have led me into my philanthropic work."

Do not expect me to enter into a theoretical discussion similar to those carried on by the able men who have developed in these pages a philosophical system regarding the duty of the possessor of riches; but allow me to set forth in a few words the practical method I have determined upon for carrying out my philanthropic ideas.

In regard to this there is, in my opinion, no possibility for doubt that the possession of great wealth lays a duty upon the possessor. It is my inmost conviction that I must consider myself as only the temporary administrator of the wealth I have amassed, and that it is my duty to contribute in my own way to the relief of the suffering of those who are hard pressed by fate. I contend most decidedly against the old system of alms-giving, which only makes so many more beggars; and I consider it the greatest problem in philanthropy to make human beings who are capable of work out of individuals who otherwise must become paupers, and in this way to create useful members of society.

Philanthropy in its proper sense has, no doubt, a higher purpose, and can find its best field for action in the creation of free

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

libraries, green parks, beautiful churches, etc. This is Mr. Carnegie's idea, which he has practically demonstrated again and again. Certainly these are ideal objects, which tend to bring about universal happiness; and lucky are they who live in lands where the absolute necessaries of life are so well supplied that, I might almost say, one sees that the obligation of riches and the purposes of philanthropy are fulfilled in supplying the necessity of æsthetic pleasures. In relieving human suffering I never ask whether the cry of necessity comes from a being who belongs to my own faith or not; but what is more natural than that I should find my highest purpose in bringing to the followers of Judaism, who have been oppressed for a thousand years, who are starving in misery, the possibility of a physical and moral regeneration? —than that I should try to free them, to build them up into capable citizens, and thus furnish humanity with much new and valuable material? Every page in the history of the Jews teaches us that in thinking this I am following no Utopian theory, and I am confident that such a result can be attained.

For it does not matter how low the disciples of the faith may have fallen, nor how crushed they may seem to be; it only needs a single breath of freedom to bring honor and stimulus to the country to which they belong. The middle ages and modern times alike prove this. It is not necessary for me to cite examples, since the famous men who have raised themselves out of the Jewish race are well enough known, and since it cannot be the object of these lines to sing the praises of the Jews or the high spiritual qualities of their people. I will therefore keep myself to the question that has been put to me to answer—What results are to follow from my philanthropic labors?

What I desire to accomplish, what, after many failures, has come to be the object of my life, and that for which I am ready to stake my wealth and my intellectual powers, is to give to a portion of my companions in faith the possibility of finding a new existence, primarily as farmers, and also as handicraftsmen, in those lands where the laws and religious tolerance permit them to carry on the struggle for existence as noble and responsible subjects of a humane government.

It has become a maxim and a typical reproach against the Jews that they have no inclination for agriculture or manual labor. That is an error which is contradicted not only by modern

examples, but by history. The Israelites in the time of Christ were agriculturists *par excellence*, while trade, which, judging from the practice of the Jews of to-day, should be the inheritance of Israel, lay then entirely in the hands of the Phœnicians, the Greeks, and the people of the Mediterranean states. The Jews, as long as they were politically independent, cared for their fields, as I have said. They drove their herds, and were handicraftsmen. The tendency towards work in the fields and in the shop existed, therefore, and my own observations and those of others have proved that it is quite possible to reawaken in the race this capacity and love for agriculture, and to bring it into existence again. Of his own power, therefore, the poor Jew, who until now has been hated as an outcast, will win for himself peace and independence, love for the ground he tills and for freedom; and he will become a patriotic citizen of his new home.

Guided by these convictions, my course for philanthropic work was clearly shown me. By establishing organizations in the Orient and in Galicia I wished to give the Jews who had remained in the faith the opportunity of becoming good farmers and craftsmen, without removing them from the land upon which they were settled, and agricultural schools and schools for manual training were to supply the means for teaching them.

It is necessary, however, to adopt some other method for aiding those Jews who are driven from their country, and are obliged to seek new homes across the ocean. And it is at present, therefore, my greatest desire to accomplish a work on a much more important scale, and of quite a different character from any adopted up to the present time—a purpose which, it may be reasonably hoped, will bring about the results already mentioned. The question is, then, to help the Russian Jews who have just been exiled from their homes to find new countries where they can use their powers freely, where they can bring into practice again the qualities they have inherited from their ancestors, and, finally, where they can become useful citizens of a free and secure country in which the rights of all inhabitants are equal.

In considering this plan, I naturally thought of the United States, where the liberal constitution is a guarantee of happy development for the followers of all religious faiths. Yet I was obliged to confess that to increase to any great extent the already enormous number of Jews in the United States would

be of advantage neither to the country itself nor to the exiled Jews; for it is my firm conviction that this new settlement should be scattered through different lands and spread over a large space, so that there shall be no opportunity for social or religious rupture. I made a study, therefore, of different countries, and after careful examination I have become convinced that the Argentine Republic, Canada, and Australia, above all others, offer the surest guarantee for the accomplishment of the plan. I expect to begin with the Argentine Republic, and arrangements for the purchase of certain lands for the settlement are now being made.

I do not undertake the execution of so weighty a work without much preparatory study as to whether the Jewish race has or has not an inclination towards agriculture. The following example will go far to silence any doubt in this direction and to prove the capacity of the Jews for farming and colonization.

Some years ago several hundred Jewish families were exiled from Russia to the Argentine. In spite of untold suffering, in spite of the greatest hindrances which they encountered, they succeeded in taking root in their new homes. These same families, which a few years ago, bending under heavy burdens, appeared to be only wandering trades-people in Russia, have now become thrifty farmers, who with plough and hoe know how to farm as well as if they had never done anything else. They lay out their farms in the best manner, and build themselves such pretty little houses that every one in the vicinity employs them as carpenters in housebuilding.

The knowledge of this guides me in my work, and I am now setting out with all my strength to accomplish it.

This is, in a few words, the idea which leads me in my philanthropic work—the motive that lies at the bottom of the plan. The working of a huge cosmopolitan scheme would scatter my strength broadcast. If I devote myself, however, to this one work, I can perhaps bring it to eventual accomplishment. And all through the matter I have the certainty that he who frees thousands of his fellow-men from suffering and an oppressed existence, and helps them to become useful citizens, does a good work for all humanity.

M. DE HIRSCH.

THE FARMERS' DISCONTENT.

BY L. L. POLK, PRESIDENT OF THE FARMERS' ALLIANCE.

But for the closing paragraph of the contribution of Mr. George E. Waring, Jr., to the June number of The Review, it might have been read and dismissed with some commendation, even by one who feels a peculiar interest in everything that touches upon the condition of the American farmer. But the remark, "That the present Alliance movement will directly improve the situation is not likely," inspires a re-reading of the article, and also an inclination to clarify some things which were passed over in the first reading as being rather erratic, but not harmful.

The discontent of the farmers threatens "a grave disturbance in the equilibrium of national affairs" may be properly regarded as the basic proposition of the article in question. This proposition alone is a most tempting one for treatment; and the treatment might be begun by asking, What is the present "equilibrium of national affairs"? It is not proposed, however, to enter upon such a discussion here, and the matter may be passed over with the statement that the farming element has ever been the first and most potential in establishing an equilibrium in a republican form of government, and in efforts to maintain it. The simple truth is, there is now no equilibrium, and the farmers are moving to restore that which may have been, or to establish an equilibrium on a broader scale than has formerly been necessary.

Mr. Waring seemingly makes an effort to detract from the importance of farming as a feature of existing social organization. It is, he says, "the basis of the social organization only in the sense of having been its beginning." The admission that it is the beginning is an admission that it is the foundation. There can be no safe and complete superstructure without a foundation, though the foundation may exist without the superstructure.

The acknowledgment that society cannot be maintained without the food-producer is made perforce; but the assertion that it cannot be maintained "without millers and butchers and grocers and cooks and the whole round of purveyors and workers" is open to questioning. It might be legitimately asked what kind of social organization demands all these workers, and what kind could be maintained without them. The present social organization demands—and the demand is supplied—speculators, race-courses, gamblers, trusts, monopolies, "combines," breweries, bar-rooms, railroad pools, subsidies, and the like. Surely Mr. Waring will not assert that a society meeting all the demands of the highest conception of civilization cannot be maintained without these.

The evidence of the past tells of quite an endurable form of society when there were no professional carpenters, cooks, millers, butchers, etc. People lived, and as a consequence we live. One of epicurean tastes, in making a comparison of the ancient and modern forms of society, might say that keeping one's self alive is not living; but there is no living without keeping alive. The engine may be beautiful, but it is useless without the steam. The banquet-hall is uninviting without the products of the farm. An attempt to rank any vocation with the importance and necessity of farming will ever prove futile.

The Hon. J. M. Rusk, Secretary of Agriculture, is authority for the statement that one-half of our population depends on agriculture. Mr. Waring says: "The fact that those in one industry outnumber those in another does not give them a greater claim to consideration." This is noticed because it conveys an implication that the farmers are demanding greater consideration than that accorded to other classes, or that somebody is demanding it for them. It would be impossible to sustain either implication. The great fundamental principle of the discontented farmers is "equal rights to all, special privileges to none." They have made demands for legislation which they believe would be beneficial to them, though not exclusively. Some of these demands have been strenuously opposed on the ground that they can be acceded to only through "class" legislation. The objection is debatable, but let it be admitted for the sake of argument. The farmer points to statute-books full of legislation in the interest of other classes, and exclaims: "Equal rights for all.

If it be right to legislate for the manufacturer and shipbuilder and banker, why not for me ?"

"But," says the legislator, "one of your tenets is 'special privileges to none.' How can you ask for special legislation ?" The farmer replies : "Yes ; 'special privileges to none.' Then take away the special privileges you have accorded to the manufacturer, the shipbuilder, and the banker."

The farmer has never made claim for greater consideration than is accorded to other classes, and only until very recently, when overwhelmed and discouraged by adverse conditions and discriminating legislation, has he asked for the same consideration from national power that nearly all other classes have enjoyed for years. The test of "industry, skill, frugality, and fair dealing" has been applied to the vocation of farming under existing economic conditions without encouraging results. The average land-owner and farmer, though exercising the most consummate skill and practising the most rigid economy, cannot hope to achieve fortune in a lifetime. The speculator in "futures" and the manipulator of stocks, with no knowledge of frugality and without legitimate skill, achieve fortunes in a day.

In defining what is "truly the basis of our national prosperity," Mr. Waring indulges in misleading, if not erroneous, language. "National prosperity" is a term which may not be properly applied to the condition of a country or society a large part of whose population is struggling under adverse and oppressive circumstances which arise from national legislation. It is a term which cannot be applied without violence to the condition of this country, whose national records show the existence of nine millions of mortgages on the farms and homesteads of sixty-three millions of people—a mortgage to every seven individuals, or a mortgage for every four families out of five. If intended to apply to such a condition as this, it is misleading. The possible error lies in the assertion that "industry, skill, frugality, and fair dealing" are the basis of national prosperity.

Mr. Waring adds : "The sphere in which these are applied is immaterial." This leaves a loop-hole of escape from every objection that may be urged to the assertion. It was evidently intended to apply to individuals in the pursuit of their various callings, and if this, and this only, were meant, the force of the assertion could be easily broken ; for there would be no difficulty

in establishing the fact that "industry, skill," etc., cannot be effective in such vocations in civilized society as may be subject to the adverse effects of discriminating legislation. But if this were shown, Mr. Waring might escape through his loop-hole by saying he meant that legislation, as well as any other component part of the social organism, must be characterized by "industry, skill, frugality, and fair dealing."

What he asserts to be the basis of our national prosperity is, in a society and civilization so large and advanced as ours, merely the basis of existence. The responsibility is not assumed here of affirming just where the line between existence and prosperity should be drawn. Let it be admitted, however, that he who has anything over and above what is necessary for actual existence is prosperous. Does the owner of this surplus, be it little or much, hold it and enjoy it by personal "industry, skill, frugality, and fair dealing," or are his tenure and enjoyment of the surplus secured and protected by such legislation or compact as the individuals composing the society are willing to submit to? If this latter question could be negatived, it would carry the affirmation that legislation is unnecessary, unless it can be established that legislation may be so framed and administered as to aid equally all the individuals of a large society in acquiring whatever is necessary to make them prosperous. To deal fully and effectively with this proposition would require a more elaborate argument than can be contained within the limits to which this article must be confined; for the presentation of such an argument would necessitate the production of a second argument to show that the realm of nationalism was not being invaded.

The proposition, however, is not new; it was a tenet of the framer of our national constitution, and was expressed by him in the words, "You can legislate prosperity or adversity on yourselves." The truth and force of this enunciation are beginning to be felt by the whole people, and they are awaking to the realization that, in a society which has reached the stage and dimensions of ours, legislation is the basis of national prosperity. In this their conviction is so strong that they are proposing legislative remedies for existing evils and inequalities; but the step was not taken until they had sought long and earnestly, but in vain, to evolve some other method of dealing effectively with the condition as it is found.

"If farmers constitute a 'class,' it is a class that is not chained to the tilling of the ground," is the opening sentence of one of Mr. Waring's divisions. The same may be said of any "class." The banker is not chained to banking, nor the manufacturer to manufacturing. But the banker never voluntarily relinquishes his vocation to indulge in farming for the purpose of achieving a livelihood, while recent statistics show that erstwhile thrifty farmers have been compelled to abandon farms and seek employment by which they could realize a living remuneration for their exertions. There are innumerable instances to show that a skill and an ability which could not wring mediocre existence from the farm have achieved phenomenal success in other pursuits. There is small risk in asserting that in no case has the abandonment of a farm been attended with more adverse conditions than those experienced on it.

One of the anxieties of the average intelligent farmer is that some provision may be made by which his son may follow some other pursuit, and the son, who may have spent a few years on the farm, entertains the liveliest sympathy with that anxiety. No further evidence is needed to show that, under the present economic conditions, almost any pursuit is considered preferable to that of farming. There may be a transient dismissal of the whole matter by saying to the farmer: "If you do not like it, other vocations are open to you." This is measurably true, but the advice is superfluous. There has been and now is a fleeing from the farms that causes an astonishing increase of population and overcrowding in the cities, and the sufferers from the overcrowding are not those who flock from the rural districts. Their rugged ability and sterling worth soon crush out such competition as is met in the life-long city element, which becomes the suffering element wherever suffering follows influx of population; and this crushed-out element is neither fitted nor able to repair to and conduct the abandoned farms. A condition which would follow a total abandonment of farms can be more easily imagined than described.

The farmer's discontent arises not so much from the limited latitude of success offered by the farm as from the impositions of legislation effected while he was devoting his whole attention to his immediate business, and intrusting his interests, as a citizen of the nation, to representatives who have betrayed that trust. The farming element is the only one in our entire social

organization that can make this complaint justly; for while some other elements may not have had special national legislation in their behalf, there have been no adverse discriminations. Nothing can be added to Mr. Waring's assertion that "farmers themselves, if a fair chance is allowed them, can and will look out for their own condition more effectively than others can." The "fair chance" is all they have asked for, but in this case asking has not been followed by receiving, and they have felt constrained to present their requests in the form of demands, and ask the nation why those demands should not be acceded to.

"Our duty of the hour, so far as the farmer is concerned, is to see that he has a fair field," is the beginning of Mr. Waring's fourth and last division. The two words "our duty" suggest some questions. From what position or elevation does he write? What coterie or element is meant to be included in that "our"? and is it a coterie or element which the farmer may trust to secure for him a fair field without himself as a supervisor or questioner? If there be an assumption that there is a duty toward the farmer from a class which appropriates a dignity and importance superior to his, he will want to know if such a class proposes to lift him to its own *high standard*. If it be assumed that this class is more able to legislate for and care for the interests of the farmer than he is to legislate for himself, he may grant the assumption, but he will not trust the class. The reckless practical disregard of pretty sentiment, and the almost general repudiation of pledges and promises expressed and made in favor of the farmer for many years, have instilled into him a notion that he must secure and maintain his "fair field" by personal exertion, if he is to have it at all; and anything now presented spreading forth a new phase of duty or conveying a new variety of pledge or promise comes too late to influence him to step aside and longer trust his interests to others. He is passing the stage where he can be deluded by flattery. He has decided that he must interest himself in his own behalf, and he will continue to demand what he conceives to be "equal rights to all, special privileges to none," until they shall be acquired, or until he shall be convinced that such a condition is impossible in what boasts itself to be a civilized society.

Mr. Waring's article concludes with a doubt whether the present Alliance movement will improve the situation. The ultimate re-

sult of any movement is more or less problematical; but the achievement of any result lies in a movement toward that end. Civilized history furnishes nothing to parallel the general and rapid spread of the Alliance; yet no movement was ever more fiercely and bitterly and unreasonably assailed, even by those who profess to be in sympathy with the very principles on which it is founded and which it seeks to establish. The organization is composed of a class of people who stay at their homes and by their firesides unless stern necessity calls them away. They did not create the necessity which called forth the organization.

The Alliance has no special desire to "directly improve the situation." That is to say, it is immaterial to the order as to whether an improvement shall come directly through it or its members, or in some other way; but its plain attitude toward the existing powers through which improvement can come is want of confidence; and, while maintaining this attitude, small pressure is needed to drive it to take such action as it can to effect a change in the general situation. It has already accomplished much, in that the largest class of our society has been led by it to study political economies and to examine into methods and machinery of government; and its influence as a political factor will be plainly evidenced in such national legislation as may be enacted while it exists as an organization. There will be less extravagance, less jobbery, and less practical corruption. If only this shall be accomplished, enough will have been done to remove any foundation on which rests doubt as to the power of the Alliance in influencing a change for the better; for with a purer administration of public affairs must come a decrease of such legislation as tends to operate for the emolument of one class or industry at the expense of another; and this is the evil against which the efforts of the Alliance are chiefly directed.

The reason given by Mr. Waring for the doubt he entertains shows that his knowledge of the sterling qualities of the American farmer is very limited, or that he, in common with many others, arrogates the right and privilege to feel a contempt for the farmer. If this be not so, why should his article close with such a gross insult to the sturdy and faithful tiller of the soil as is conveyed in the following words: "There are already indications that professional politicians will buy farms, will pay the expense of Alliance meetings, and will capture the Alliance vote"?

What can this be but an implication that the organized farmers of America are a herd of human beings over whom tangible corruption will have more influence than justice and right? and what is it but the strong reflection of a hope entertained by certain classes that it may be so? The farmers admit without reservation that they have been grievously deceived and imposed upon, but they have never sanctioned the enactment of a single national measure under which they now suffer through the influence of corruption. Being honest in heart themselves, they trusted others, only to be environed by such conditions as have brought upon them a discouragement which paralyzes their energies and weakens their patriotism as applied to the upholding of affairs of government, and which threatens the destruction of their domesticity. Having learned, and knowing, that these conditions are artificial, they have arisen to demand that the power which made them shall remove them; and they cannot be made to waver in their demands by a declaration that corruption will be made their antagonizing force. As a class they will maintain their sincerity and honesty, and the only corruption that shall prevail against them will be such as can be found in a preponderating number of corrupt men.

L. L. Polk.

THE FARMER ON TOP.

BY ERASTUS WIMAN.

It is a safe assertion that no subject is quite so important to the world as the world's supply of food. Progress in civilization, in science, in art, even in religion, is all bound up in the problem of getting enough to eat. The life that is forms the essential element in the life that is to come, whether on this earth or elsewhere; and the ability to get enough to eat, of the best kind, and commensurate with a moderate effort, is a matter of greater interest, of more far-reaching importance, than any other that can occupy the mind.

In a period of such abundant plenty as in the last quarter of a century seems to have oppressed the world, it would look akin to folly to begin to talk about an impending scarcity of food-products. When the chief evil of the generation of producers now passing away has been that of overproduction, resulting in destruction of profit, it would indeed be a revolution of vast import if the coming generation of producers were able to grow only just enough to meet the demand, and be enormously enriched thereby. When by improved means of communication, owing to parallel strips of iron laid through the country, vast stretches of territory have been made readily available, together with the result of man's inventive faculty as applied to agricultural implements, the power to produce food has been enormously stimulated, to begin to talk about a possible limit to production seems a startling change in conditions. Especially is it a startling change when, in view of these widened areas, and this marked success in the employment of machinery to perform the work of human hands, resulting in a consequent perfection in agricultural pursuits, there should be slowly, but most certainly, creeping up a power to absorb and consume of even greater proportions. Yet it is a fact, as startling as it is true to those who watch closely the trend of

supply and demand in the article of food, that the power of absorption or consumption of food-products has at length caught up to the power of production ; and that the possible ratio of increase in consumption is much greater than the immediate possible ratio of increase in the growth of food.

Perhaps more clearly than by anything else this is shown in three totals of the figures of the census now being completed ; these being that, while the whole country has increased in population over 26 per cent., the cities have grown at a rate of increase of over 45 per cent., while the farming population has increased only 14 per cent. The growth of consumption of food-products, as shown by the growth of cities, is proportionately greater than has ever been shown in an equal period heretofore in the world's history. Though the increase in the number of farmers in ten years to the extent of 14 per cent. is greater than is shown elsewhere in the world during the decade, yet the disparity between 14 and 45 per cent. is so great that a moment's reflection will show its deep significance in relation to the production and consumption of food. The aggregations of humanity in the cities and towns are in no broad sense food-producers, but in the largest sense food-consumers and food-wasters.

But in the face of the great increase in the demand for produce, implied by the growth of cities and towns, there stalks into sight an apparition, in the shape of another condition, so unexpected and so startling as hardly to be credited. This is nothing more or less than a realization of two important facts : (1) the extent of the exhaustion of arable soils ; (2) the hardly realizable circumstance that no more new wheat lands remain unoccupied in the United States. In other words, if a farmer's son or a new-comer seeks to secure land that will probably produce bread, to do so he must displace an occupant already in possession, or go without. That a "land-hunger" should at this early date in the history of the country exist, and be unappeased, would seem impossible on a continent whose land areas were supposed to be illimitable, and whose soil was supposed to be inexhaustible. That no lands are available is a conclusion so unexpected and so extraordinary that it is no wonder people doubt the truth of such a statement. Yet that a land-hunger of the keenest character does exist is proved in numerous sections, and perhaps more vividly than by anything else by the scenes which occurred at the

opening of the territory of Oklahoma two years ago, and which have since been repeated with terrible earnestness on every occasion upon which government land-offices were open for allotment of homesteads. When, as in Ashland, Wisconsin, last winter, men and women stand in line, ankle deep in snow, all day and all night, from Thursday until Saturday, waiting for their turn to register; and when the Secretary of the Interior at a later date was compelled to close the land-office because it was in possession of a mob, who only became such because of their eager desire for the registration of their names, there is proof of a craze for land which nothing else in the previous history of this country has paralleled.

Perhaps the most striking sign of the exhaustion of soils, on the one hand, and the rapid occupancy of lands, on the other, is found in connection with the production of wheat, and its steady northern trend until now half the continent is fed by supplies from the northernmost States. The reader will confirm this by his or her own experience, in realizing the simple circumstance that the bread habitually served for meals in the household comes from Minnesota or Dakota, or from a region quite as far away. Why an article so essential to human life as wheaten flour, which should be furnished at a cost so free from unnecessary charges, and which is in universal use in quantities so vast, should be subjected to a charge for freightage averaging from 1,000 to 2,000 miles, is a problem that can only be answered by the statement that it cannot be produced with profit nearer. It was not always so. Many readers of these pages, especially those resident in the Eastern and Middle States, are old enough to recall the fact that nearly all the wheat consumed in their youthful days was grown in the Genesee valley of New York. Rochester was named the "Flour City" because of its great mills in the midst of a great wheat-yielding region. It is still called by a name that sounds similar, viz., the "Flower City," but this is because of the great nurseries and seed-gardens that so adorn it. It has been robbed of its glory as a food-centre by Minneapolis, 2,000 miles to the north, now the great flour-producing city, from which radiate supplies that keep alive fully one-half the population of this once great agricultural country.

When the regions that supply the mills of Minneapolis are exhausted, as the regions, so far as wheat is concerned, between the

Genesee valley and the valley of the Red River of the North have been exhausted, what new Northern State will step in to supply the need that will be so imperative as that of food? Abandoned farms in the half-dozen States of New England, the exhausted soils in the Middle States, the urgent need for expensive fertilization in numerous Western areas, are supplemented in suggestiveness by the discovery of the limitations of the rain-belt in western Kansas and Nebraska, and the universality of the movement near the Rocky Mountains for expensive irrigation in wide areas of soil too poor by nature to be cultivated except by artificial aids.

It is true that this wide survey of the conditions apparent on the surface of the country includes many a verdant valley, and many a hillside where wheat and other bread grains can and will be grown with profit; and that perhaps the inferences drawn of exhaustion and sterility for wheat may be extreme. But the fact remains that with the growth in the consumption of bread the immediate power to produce it in numerous wide localities does not keep pace; and that even in wheat-growing areas the increase is in meagre proportion to the increase in the number of mouths to be filled. The limitations in area are within sight; the power of production to the average acreage is known; but the growth of human life—the increase in the number to consume—is without limit. If it goes on by the same leaps and bounds in the next fifty years as in the last half-century, there are children now living who will see the population of this country from one hundred and fifty to two hundred millions of people, which vast aggregation will derive its bread from an area that even now has reached the northern boundary and is beginning to realize for its food out-put prices far in excess of what a brief period ago were deemed possible.

But it is unnecessary to wait fifty years, or anything like it, to realize the consequences of an exhaustion of the raw material from which profitable farms are made. The rapidity with which farms were taken up and the spare land occupied between 1870 and 1880 has been the cause of the depression which so universally prevailed among the farmer class. Excessive competition was its curse, and overproduction the cause of the low prices and the destruction of its profit. This is shown by the fact that for the fourteen years ending with 1885 the cultivated area of the United

States increased 112 per cent., while the population increased but 44 per cent. But the very rapidity of occupancy is now producing its reactionary effect, not because there is a lessened demand for land or a restricted number of cultivators, nor even because of low prices, but because there is so little unoccupied land available which it is profitable to cultivate. While the population continues to increase at the rate of 12½ per cent. in every five years, the area now being taken up has not in that period increased 7 per cent., and it is yearly and progressively lessening. In this connection the fact is a most significant one that the quantity of land in cultivation, the production of which is necessarily marketed abroad, has declined from twenty-one millions of acres in 1885 thirteen millions in 1890.

Confirmatory of this statement of the general conditions of production and occupancy of land is a striking compilation by Mr. C. Wood Davis, of Goddard, Kansas, who, as a farmer himself, obtained a perfect knowledge of the practical difficulties that surround his class, and who, as a painstaking student of statistics, has furnished to his fellow-farmers, and to the people at large, conclusions that have placed the whole country under an obligation to him. From numerous calculations of great value, forming the basis of much of the discussion now going forward on this most important topic of the food supply and the farmer's position, the following is selected as illustrative of the progressively decreasing rate at which additions are made to the cultivable area, which, being certain to continue while the population increases at a greater ratio, will result in placing the farmer on top:

Year.	Cultivated area in staple crops.	Increase of cultivated area in each period and rate per cent. of increase.		Increase of cultivated area each year during each period and yearly per cent. of increase.	
	Acres.	Acres.	Rate per cent.	Acres.	Rate per cent.
1871	93,000,000	.....	....	....	...
1875	123,000,000	30,000,000	*32.2	7,500,000	8.1
1880	165,000,000	*42,000,000	34.1	8,240,000	6.8
1885	197,000,000	32,000,000	19.4	6,400,000	3.9
1890	211,000,000	*14,000,000	*7.1	2,800,000	1.4

* Note rapid diminution in aggregates of such increase and in the rate per cent.

The inference to be drawn from this steady decline in increase of percentage of area of cultivation is that prices must advance if

there is a corresponding increase in consumption, as there is certain to be. It is true that a foreign demand regulates prices, and that the out-put of foreign nations may make up for the decrease in the surplus from America. But this argument is met with the inquiry, If the bread-producing areas in the new world are lessening in proportion to consumption, what may not be inferred from conditions that prevail in crowded Europe, where land is scarce and population increasingly large? The apparent facts do not justify the conclusion that hereafter foreign sources of supply will largely influence either out-put or prices. Indeed, the action of almost all the European countries indicates a great anxiety in regard to this question of food-products, in the face of increase of population and extreme narrowness of cultivable area, as shown in the removal of restrictions and reductions of duty, which almost every week recently have been reported.

The figures regarding the increased wheat area the world over are ascertained, and not only show how large a percentage is contained within the United States, but how marked is the decrease in proportion to population. Thus, in the decade from 1870 to 1880 the wheat areas of the world increased twenty-two millions of acres, of which the United States contributed nineteen millions. In the decade from 1880 to 1890 the wheat areas of the world increased only five millions of acres, to which the United States contributed not an acre. Meanwhile the population of the bread-eating world increased 11 per cent., and goes on increasing irrespective of the fact that the land which can grow grain at previous prices is well-nigh exhausted, so far as relative increase is concerned. Take, for instance, the population of India. It is said to be increasing three times as fast as its cultivable area, and although its exports rose in seventeen years from 500,000 bushels to 41,000,000 bushels in 1887, the increase, it is believed, has reached its limit. Because of the increase of population and the restricted area of cultivation, the inhabitants cannot afford to cultivate wheat, much less live upon it, as is shown by the fact that the area under wheat cultivation at the end of 1889 was a million acres less than ten years ago. The whole situation seems summed up in *The American Agriculturist* for May in these brief words:

"It is quite safe to say that the yearly additions to the bread-eating populations of European blood are such as to require an addition yearly to

the wheat and rye supply of the world of from 30,000,000 to 32,000,000 bushels, or the product of 2,500,000 to 2,700,000 acres. Yet the entire wheat- and rye-growing world has, of recent years, been adding not to exceed 400,000 acres per annum, or less than one-sixth of the increased requirements. Moreover, there is no country where the present rate of increase is likely to be much accelerated at an early day."

Bearing with great force upon this question of food-supply is the fact that this is the census year in most of the world. The results of an enumeration so world-wide enable accurate estimates to be formed of the growth in consumption of food; and as the areas and productiveness of food-lands are ascertained with more or less definiteness the inferences to be drawn all point in the direction of an increasing tax upon the producing power of the world. For instance, the United Kingdom is cultivated to an extent beyond which it would be difficult to improve; yet its population, by the census just completed (on the night of April 5), shows 39,700,000, or an increase of 3,000,000 in five years. Austria-Hungary completed the census last month, showing an increase of 2,250,000. Germany in five years has grown 2,265,000, now reaching 49,120,000, as against 41,058,000 ten years ago. France, the country with the smallest percentage of growth, has a million more mouths to feed than in 1885, while Russia is known to have increased 10,000,000 in the first five years of the decade, and certainly as much in the last five years, thus adding 20,000,000 to the newcomers into the world. Italy, notwithstanding heavy emigration, will, it is estimated, add 1,000,000 to its population, while India is believed to have grown in ten years from 255,000,000 to 285,000,000. Grouping the increase in all these eight countries together, it shows in the old world the addition of over 76,000,000 of lives to be sustained by food got from the ground, without anything like corresponding increase in either cultivable area or in its productiveness.

In startling connection with the foregoing figures of new population, it is appropriate to draw again upon the calculations of Mr. C. Wood Davis, who from the eyry of his farm in Kansas, after careful observation, startles the world with the following conclusions:

"From the best data obtainable it would appear that with an average yield the world's crop of wheat and rye is now 70,000,000 bushels less than the yearly consumption. Each passing year, by reason of the increase in population, adds at least 25,000,000 bushels to this yearly deficit, so that by 1895 it can hardly be less than 200,000,000, if the *per-capita* requirements re-

main as large as they have been. Up to this time the reserves accumulated during the existence of the surplus acreage added in the eighth decade have sufficed to meet this deficit, but there are indications in every grain-growing country that these reserves are everywhere nearly or quite exhausted. The injury already sustained by the growing European crop renders it absolutely certain that the coming cereal year will dispose of the last vestige of these reserves."

Sufficient has been adduced to make it plain that the possibility of prices remaining at a low ebb is past. Is is clear, therefore, that the farmer hereafter will realize a fair profit upon his operations. It is time that he should do so. Of all classes his rewards have been the smallest, while they should have been the most satisfactory.

The extent of the farmer's loss by low prices and the extent of his gain by high prices may be judged by the advance in the amount to be realized in these different conditions. Thus in 1875 the average price in gold of English-grown wheat in the markets of Great Britain was $1.64 per bushel. During the five years ending with 1889 it was 95 cents per bushel. In other words, there was a difference of 69 cents, equal to a decline of 42 per cent. in the income of every wheat-producer, and, as a matter of fact, of every producer of food, arising out of compulsory exports from India and the creation of too many American farms. With a restoration of the former high price, the gain to the producer will equal the amount of which he has hitherto been deprived. Now, an increase of 42 per cent. in the income of any individual, or any class of individuals, is a most momentous matter. But when it affects a class so large as that which follows agricultural pursuits, and when, in addition to that special class, it equally and directly affects the vast number in town and village who are related to and dependent upon the farmer, the consequences of an increase of revenue to such a great percentage can hardly be overestimated.

It is true that the difference in the price of wheat in Great Britain in 1875, when it was $1.64, and for the five years ending with 1889, when it averaged only 90 cents, may not be immediately made up, but all the signs are in favor of dollar wheat at the farm, and, if anything, above that sum. It is also true that wheat does not comprise by any means the total out-put of the farmer, but the price of wheat is the key to the agricultural situ-

ation, for out of 13,500,000 acres now used for the production of food for exportation, between 8,000,000 and 9,000,000 are devoted to wheat-growing. It is the one great staple that all the nations of western and southern Europe export largely, and is the one grain for which a market, at some price, can always be found, while it bears transportation and storage with less deterioration than any other food-product. As wheat rises or falls, all other food-products increase or decline, and if a gain of 40 per cent. in the rise of wheat is promised to the farmer, it may be relied upon that this relative gain is likely to pervade all his crops.

An increase equal to 40 per cent. in the paying power of the farmer of North America will make at this time a greater economic revolution than has ever yet been witnessed. The first thing that will happen will be that the farmer will get out of debt. The sorrowful years of burden which in the last decade he has suffered from heavy obligations of mortgage, interest, and store-indebtedness will cause him to hasten the day when he can be a free man. As a borrower, he will no longer fill the position of servant to the lender. Having once hypothecated their future in the expectation of continued prosperity and high prices in the past, as a class the farmers have had an experience that most men would have sunk under. The pursuit of happiness, which is a guarantee under the constitution, and which in this fair land more than in all others would seem easy of accomplishment, has been like chasing an *ignis fatuus* in a huge fog-bank of indebtedness. The weary waiting for better times, the nights of sleepless anxiety, and the days of unrequited labor, the narrowness of resources, and the eager desire of the young people for better modes of living, have all been borne in expectation of the day that now dawns upon every industrious farmer in the land. It was no wonder that unrest prevailed, and that a striking-out for relief in legislation, or some other form of remedy by organization, was tried. But the futility of those movements is even now becoming apparent to them, and will sink out of sight in the certainty of improvement in conditions which is sure to follow the gain in purchasing and paying power of 40, or even 25, per cent. It seems impossible to doubt from all that has been here adduced that such a change is coming.

This change will put the American farmer on top. It will make him, of all classes in the world, the most prosperous. He

will be the most independent and the most intelligent and prosperous producer of his period, and by organization and a reasonable control of politics, which he is likely to maintain, he will probably dictate the fiscal policy of the nation. Having attained prosperity by the operation of natural laws, he will abandon the absurd theories under which, in the days of his depression, some of his representatives sought relief by laws made by legislation; and it will not be surprising if he reaches the conclusion that the least interference with trade, the least taxation, and the least legislation will be the popular movement, setting in as a reactionary sentiment from that which has hitherto prevailed.

With an ability to buy twice or thrice the quantity of goods hitherto absorbed, with a desire to possess himself of every comfort, and to deny his children nothing that they need and can enjoy, the absorption of manufactured goods will be enormously increased. The excess in production of articles of necessity and luxury, now apparent on every hand, will be absorbed. This process, aided by an increased foreign trade, which is promised under reciprocity, would seem to open up a prospect for still another great group of population, namely, those engaged in manufacturing pursuits. These have already begun to feel the pressure of overproduction, as evidenced in numerous labor troubles all over the country. But with the improved condition of the farmer, a larger demand will exist for all classes of goods. Every farmer's wife will be able to afford a silk dress; every farmer's daughter will have an elaborate trousseau. From ploughs to pianos, from buggies to books, the range will include all articles for farm life, for which a new demand will be stimulated by a new ability to buy and to pay. There will, doubtless, therefore, be felt throughout the country a new thrill of industrial activity, as the necessary reflection of the enhanced prosperity of the greatest and the most worthy group of growers that the world has ever seen.

ERASTUS WIMAN.

DOMESTIC SERVICE IN ENGLAND.

BY MISS EMILY FAITHFULL.

THE relations existing between servants and their employers have been much discussed of late: we have been told that an antagonism is growing up which is "shaking the pillars of domestic peace"; one writer inveighs against "the semi-feudal relations" and holds a spirited brief for the maid; another declares that "good old-fashioned mistresses" have died out, while in certain quarters the problem is considered "as momentous as that of capital and labor, and as complicated as that of individualism and socialism."

In one of George Eliot's novels, the landlord whose customers appeal to him to settle an argument which has arisen in the bar parlor about a village ghost-tale, states his intention of "holding with both sides, as the truth lies between them." I confess that his attitude very much represents my own feeling when I hear of the faults and follies of servants and the grinding tyranny of the nineteenth-century mistress. There is an old proverb to the effect that "one story is very well till the other is told"; and perhaps the whole grievance might be well summed up in the assertion that imperfect masters and mistresses cannot get perfect servants, and that servants are no more a failure than any other class laboring under disadvantages to which I shall more particularly allude before the end of my observations on this vexed question.

It may be true that domestic relations have not adjusted themselves at present to the modern spirit of human life, but there is no clear evidence that the servants of to-day are really inferior to those who waited on our ancestors in olden times; and in spite of the oft-repeated tale that there are "no servants to be had," I have never yet met any one who ever sought one in vain. Although the class of people who never dreamt of having servants a hundred years ago require them now, still the supply is

equal to the demand; and this, too, in spite of the system of emigration which takes hundreds of young English and Irish women to the colonies and America.

It is not within the purpose of this article to touch upon the difficulties which surround domestic service in the United States; but I may, perhaps, be allowed to remark that I was much struck, while travelling there, with the independent bearing of "the help," especially in the far West, and also with the vast amount of work done in large houses by one or two women—mostly Irish—with only the assistance of the man who comes once a day to do "the chores." Similar establishments to these in England would demand from four to six servants; but it must be admitted that social habits are more simple in America and labor-saving machines are far more abundant: lifts connect the kitchen with the dining-room in even ordinary houses, and the hot- and cold-water pipes which are connected with the washstands in the bedrooms considerably diminish the housemaids' duties, especially as there is an outlet for the water used as well.

In America "the hired girl" is apt to leave at a moment's notice if anything displeases her, but an English servant seldom packs up her boxes and places her mistress in this inconvenient position: she gives a month's notice if she finds her place does not suit her, and as she looks to her mistress for a character, she is generally anxious to make a good impression before leaving. On the other hand, a lady has no right to discharge a servant without due warning; she is only justified in dismissing a servant "at a moment's notice" on the grounds of wilful disobedience to lawful orders, drunkenness, theft, habitual negligence or moral misconduct, abusive language, and incompetence or permanent incapacity from illness. In Scotland a six-months' engagement generally prevails—a system which is far less satisfactory to both the contracting parties if a mistake has been made by either of them.

No lady is legally bound to give a domestic servant a character, but it is an unwritten law that a mistress should fairly state all she knows in favor of the girl who is leaving her service: such communications are regarded as "privileged," but any evidence of malice would render the person guilty of it liable to an action at the suit of the servant, and "a false character" "knowingly given" can be punished by a penalty of £20 if the servant in whose

interest it has been made robs the mistress who in consequence of such a misrepresentation takes her into her employment.

The "I'm-as-good-as-you" sort of spirit is by no means the characteristic of the well-trained English servant: her own self-respect teaches her to accord the deference due to those she serves, and she takes a pride in the dainty cap and spotless white apron which are regarded in America as "badges of slavery," for they distinguish her from the type of servants employed in inferior houses where such adornments are unknown and are regarded by mistresses as useless "luxuries."

There is a wide gulf between the ordinary "slavey" and the well-disciplined servant, both as regards personality and treatment. The general servant may perhaps have a "good time" of it in the tradesman's household where she is literally treated as one of the family, and fancies her equality established by the fact that she addresses all the children by their Christian names, takes her place with the family at meals, and spends her Sunday "in" at ease in the one sitting-room in the establishment, in familiar intercourse with her employers. But the lodging-house "slavey" has no rest for the sole of her foot from one week's end to the other. Her mistress, a woman of the same class probably, often treats her with a want of consideration that no lady could possibly show: it is true that the woman works very hard herself, cooking the meals of the lodgers, who breakfast and dine at different hours, but she is, of course, fortified by the gains she is making; the poor drudge, however, is toiling from morning to night for a mere pittance of perhaps £10 to £12 a year, learning nothing that will ever fit her for a better situation, and with hard words, instead of thanks, for all her efforts to please every one.

I shall never forget the impression made on my own mind by an incident which occurred to me when I had rooms in a lodging-house in one of the most fashionable parts of London, while the house I had bought was being decorated for me. I went to my bedroom after being at the first performance of a play at the Lyceum, at which Mr. Irving had been required to make a speech, and, coming home very late and tired, hastily retired to rest by the dim light of a melancholy candle. While undressing I was startled by a sound which warned me that some one was in my room: on looking round I saw what at first seemed to me a bun-

dle of clothes hanging over a chair; it turned out to be the poor "slavey," who, worn out with the day's fatigues, while putting the finishing touches to my bedroom had sat down and fallen sound asleep in the armchair. She must have been there for at least two hours! Up at six o'clock in the morning, seldom able to go to bed in her miserable attic till after midnight, and only half-fed, this unfortunate girl may be regarded as a type of a class of servants in England who are really much to be pitied.

A girl whose "first place" is in a lodging-house, or who, as the hard-worked, underfed scrub in a small tradesman's large family, in which the care of the perpetual baby falls to her lot, as well as housework of all kinds, has no sinecure; she seldom finds any one who tries to give her an idea of the intelligent, methodical way in which she should set about her duties, and is consequently disgusted with the vocation, anxious to abandon it for the freedom of the factory, and ready to advise all her companions to do the same. The miserable little drudge has been treated by the petty tyrants into whose hands she unfortunately fell as one who was to be used as their abject slave, without the least regard to her feelings or inclinations; she has been made to rise early and go to bed late; her food has been the leavings of the master's table; her work dirty and disagreeable; often she has been watched as if her honesty was suspected, and her liberty has been so curtailed that what should have been her home has been converted into a prison. How can we wonder that servant girls under these conditions are "slatternly, slothful, and impudent," or that such an experience should make them inclined to seek some other means of livelihood?

Good general servants are much sought after by families living in substantial houses and in a fairly comfortable fashion. They command wages varying from £16 to £22 a year, and resemble "the crew of the captain's gig" in Mr. Gilbert's famous "Bab Ballad," inasmuch as they have to be cook, parlor-maid, and housemaid all in one. Some servants like these places, for, though they have more work to do, they have far more freedom than it is possible to allow in large establishments; "the general" has no kitchen warfare, at any rate, and only her mistress to please; she has no upper servant to obey, and no "tempers" or moments of jealousy to ruffle her serenity, and she often ends in taking a genuine pride in the house and a keen interest in the family,

sharing their triumphs and sorrows after her own honest, hearty fashion.

The servants employed by the wealthy middle families and "the upper ten thousand" are not badly paid, and they are certainly not badly treated. When domestic service in England is compared with the position of needlewomen, compositors, and telegraph and telephone operators, the showing is certainly in favor of the former in comfort; the parlor-maid is better lodged, better fed, and, although she may receive only £20 a year, it is really equivalent to £70: the money value of her improved position would far more than treble her wages if it were paid in coin. A competent "table-maid" now asks from £18 to £30 a year; a well-trained housemaid, from £16 to £25; cooks, from £20 to £60; footmen earn from £25 to £40, with suits of livery; butlers, from £50 to £80; in some houses where the butler has great responsibility, and no house-steward is kept, he receives more than £100 a year. The skilled man *chef*, of course, earns his hundreds, while the modest kitchen maid welcomes from £10 to £18. The wages of housekeepers vary from £30 to £50 in private families; the head nurse and the lady's maid receive from £20 to £35; and in certain quarters still higher salaries are given. Mrs. Crawshay's scheme for "lady helps" has not been at all generally adopted. I have always advocated the employment of a lady in the nursery: the advantage to the children in health, manners, and morals would be of immense gain to any household rich enough to afford it, and by such means we might help to stamp out the foolish notion that there is any social degradation in domestic service.

One of the trials of the English housekeeper who has a large retinue under her command is the servant who is always on the defensive respecting her individual rights and place. "I keep to my bargain; let other people keep to theirs," is her obstinate cry, and she refuses to lend a hand outside her "own work," no matter who may suffer. The most obliging and civil servants I have ever met with are those employed by royalty and in aristocratic houses. While the "little middle-class snob" treats her servants with curtness, the well-bred woman of rank accepts their services with courtesy and grace; although she knows she has a perfect right to command them, *noblesse oblige*, and she has the self-respect which naturally accords the respect due to dependents.

The late outcry against servants strikes me as somewhat unfair and uncalled for. The prize given by Messrs. Cassell in connection with *The Quiver*, about three years ago, proved that the 1,500 servants who competed for it had lived from ten to upwards of twenty years in the same family. My own sister has a nurse who has been in her household for forty years—ever since her eldest son was born ; another friend has had the same housemaid for more than twenty-five years and a coachman for fifteen ; and many others tell me of servants who have lived with them for periods extending from twelve to twenty years. While we sigh for the good old-fashioned servants who gave their employers "the heart service alone worth having," we are apt to forget the changes which have taken place in social life, the results of which are stamped as deeply on the servants as on ourselves. If restless ambition and discontent prevail in the kitchen, we must not overlook the fact that they first invaded the drawing-room. Nor can we be blind to the influence exercised by the widespread love of change and dress, and our servants are keen enough to see when employers live beyond their means and "make a show," for this generally brings about the petty screwings which press hardest on the household. But it may well be asked, "Who are the tyrants —the mistresses who desire to have reasonable rules carried out in their own houses, or the servants who want their own way in everything, and try to rule their mistresses in the bargain ?"

The relation between mistress and maid would be undoubtedly improved if the former had a more practical knowledge of household duties. Many of "our daughters" marry young and in utter ignorance of the management of a house : if middle-class girls knew something about domestic economy, the pockets of struggling husbands would be spared and many a domestic breeze avoided. I am now alluding to the mistresses who "run their own households" : the aristocracy know but little of their servants—save their personal attendants—and complain still less.

The monotony and restrictions which surround the life of the ordinary servant have given rise to most of the objections which have been raised against the occupation. "To clean herself" after a hard day's work and sit down to needlework, or to the more exciting recreation afforded by *The Family Herald*, is scarcely exhilarating enough for the modern servant, and the joy

of the alternate "Sunday out" and the occasional holiday is spoilt by the hour fixed for the enforced return. The parlor-maid hears her young ladies talking at the dinner table of the delightful play they have seen the night before, and she is naturally inspired with a wish to see it herself; but this is impossible if the door is to be barred at 10 o'clock, especially as she has to find her way home in an omnibus, for which she probably has to wait half an hour when the play is over. The truth is that mistresses, as a rule, have not yet accepted a condition to which men in command of others have long since bowed—that pleasure and personal liberty in moderation must be accorded when the day's work is done. Servants are mostly young women in the prime of life, with all the instincts of youth full upon them, and it is cruel to ignore their social needs. Their followers and visitors are not welcome to those in authority, and therefore less objection should be raised to their occasional efforts to obtain the companionship of their own class outside the house when their work is done.

I fear we must own to another fault in dealing with our servants: women scold and nag in a way which is unknown to men who are really fit to rule. They listen to the gossip of other servants, and almost lie in wait for the suspected delinquent. A wise master knows the value of sometimes shutting his eyes, and will certainly let a good employee have time to recover himself before he attempts any expostulation. The ordinary mistress unfortunately summons the servant before she has controlled her own temper, and the result is disastrous to both. If once "a hostile attitude" describes the relation between the drawing-room and the kitchen, a state of constant friction must ensue.

I do not ignore the trials experienced by the mistresses of untrained servants: too often a succession of wasteful, ignorant girls pass, like phantasmagoria, across the threshold, leaving, however, a very convincing proof of their reality in the wreck of kitchen utensils, china, and other household treasures. Where large establishments are kept, young servants are carefully taught their separate duties; but it is a deplorable fact that girls who have passed the fifth board-school standard are often incapable of lighting a fire, or of washing a wine-glass without breaking it. They can read the "penny dreadful," but they cannot darn their stockings or mend their clothes. The want of technical train-

ing is the disadvantage which has threatend to make servants a failure; but our board schools are now waking up to their responsibilities; they have begun to include needlework and cooking in their list of subjects, and I hope they will shortly add laundry and house work.

Mrs. Darwin appears to think that the mistress who demands a formal character of the servant should be willing to furnish one respecting herself. She writes in *The Nineteenth Century*:

"Every mistress should choose a referee, or two referees, among her servants past or present, who have been with her not less than two years; she should give the names and addresses of these two referees to the servant whom she is inclined to engage before she writes for her character from her last mistress. . . . I cannot imagine any reasonable objection to this plan. If carried largely into practice, it could become the test of any theory about domestic service. Mistresses could then gather statistics and make generalizations as to the situations which were most highly recommended and most sought after by the best and most competent of servants. It might also put spirit into the custom of character-giving, which is said by some to be so formal. Personally, I have never found it so. It puts a vast amount of irresponsible power into the hands of one fallible human being; and though I think it may rarely be abused, it adds tremendously to the unnecessary and injurious dependence of servants."

This novel idea has partially been indorsed by the Hon. Maud Stanley, whose work and experience certainly entitle her to speak with authority. I confess I cannot think the plan likely to promote the cordial relations we are all anxious to secure; nor do I follow Mrs. Darwin in her argument that domestic service has necessarily a deteriorating effect on the character. The very nature of it makes it depend upon the individual character on both sides, and no arbitrary external rules will ever bring about a satisfactory improvement.

On the whole, I do not believe that there ever was a time when servants in England were better treated and better fed and allowed more liberty than at present: they might, perhaps, be better lodged, for English architects seem to have thought but little of the rooms servants would have to work and sleep in, and the condition of some of our handsomest city houses is not without reproach in this direction. Perhaps some day this may be remedied, when women's attention is turned to the interior arrangements of our houses. Miss Charlotte Robinson (Home Art Decorator to Her Majesty) is already helping us to make our

homes beautiful, and the aid of feminine domestic mechanical engineers who will help us to overcome the difficulties by which domestic machinery is still surrounded, and the feminine architect who will not sacrifice everything to the drawing-room and dining-room, will be most acceptable to all who wish to secure the health and comfort of the entire household. Some servants at present live below the ground and sleep under the slates, or have to be content with a turn-up bedstead among the black beetles and cockroaches which disport themselves in the pantry.

There is, however, but little wanton neglect of servants nowadays, nor do I think servants are less industrious or more incompetent than in the days of our "forebears." The infirmities of humanity and the spirit of the age are not likely to be confined to one section of society: all classes have been more or less seized by this restless craving for change and not unnatural wish to "better themselves." Good mistresses, as a rule, still manage to get good servants, who are not in a hurry to leave them; the English servant may consider herself well off compared to other wage-earning women, and, provided she does not squander her wages on dress, she is able, while living in comfort, to save sufficient money to provide either for marriage or old age.

EMILY FAITHFULL.

LOAFING AND LABORING.

BY THE LATE EDWIN P. WHIPPLE.

A PHILOSOPHER has divided human beings into two classes, namely, benefactors and malefactors. It would, perhaps, be a more comprehensive classification to divide them into laborers and loafers, for in whichever direction we look we find the class that loafs more or less undoing the beneficent work of the class that labors. The laborers brought us out of the primitive woods; the loafers would have been content to run wild in them forever. To the laborers we owe civilization; to the loafers, most of the evil that disfigures it. From the tilling of the soil to the tilling of the soul, through all arts, occupations, and professions, the man who shirks his task is the great disorganizer. Lands run to waste and men go to ruin, policies fail and battles are lost, literature ceases to inspire and churches to save, simply because, by some trick of fortune, the idler loafs into the laborer's place, and saunters through duties whose proper performance demands the full energies of the body and mind. The right man in the right place!—oh, if we could always have him! The wrong man in the right place!—is not that too often our exasperating experience?

But even when the loafer is too indolent to go through positive duties in a negative way, when he spares the world the hypocrisy of undertaking to perform any of its real business, it is still the fatality of his condition that he can assume activity only to prosecute some scheme of vice and mischief. Life without serious work is life deprived of all vigor but that which comes out in fits and starts of depravity. The loafer is thus ever a curse to others; but then Providence has so bound up our duties to society with our own happiness that no man can be a curse to others without also being a curse to himself.

If we explore the causes of loaferism in human nature, we shall find that they are reducible to one, namely, imbecility of will,

feebleness of personality. Oh, if we could only realize what is meant by that simple phrase, "force of will"! There is something strangely inspiring in every example of its resolute exercise. Take, for example, Balzac, the renowned French romancer. "When," he says, "I took my modest apartment in Paris, I had heavy debts to discharge—something like 50,000 francs; and what had I to face them with? Nothing but a ream of paper, a bundle of quills, a penknife, a bottle of ink, my youth, AN IRON WILL, and a robust energy to overcome all difficulties and break through all obstacles." Of course, in the end he succeeded.

And the "bundle of quills" and the "bottle of ink" were the only visible capital with which the great master-workman in contemporary English romance started on that wonderful career of creative industry by which he peopled the imagination of the world with the products of his shaping brain and beneficent heart. Among the qualities of Charles Dickens, force of will was the one power which made all his other powers efficient. Without that, the intensely-conceived and patiently-elaborated characters which have added so much to our knowledge of men and so much to our love of men, which have provoked so much human laughter and drawn forth so many purifying tears, would have died, like an opium-eater's dreams, in the mind where they had their birth, instead of spreading over the earth to melt, inspire, and gladden the souls worthy to receive them. It is the laboring man in the field of literary creation that I here desire specially to celebrate, and the protest which Charles Dickens has made, by precept, characterization, and example, against all forms of loafing.

Man has been defined as an intelligence served by organs. It would be more exact to say that he is a personality served by intelligence and using organs. The will, the power of self-direction, that which individualizes a human being, which constitutes him a person who can say "I" and "my"—this is his essential characteristic, and this makes him a laborer. The indolent self-surrender of the person to the impulse or caprice of the moment, the lack of intelligent object in life, the slow fading-away of strength at the heart of his being, and his consequent disposition to drift with the stream of things rather than to guide their course—this is what dehumanizes a man, and makes him a loafer. It is only hard to be a laborer because it is hard to be a man.

Effort, inward energy, power of will, being thus the distinguishing attribute of manhood, or, rather, selfhood, the fatigue which comes from overwork is not so intolerable to bear as the listlessness which torments the wretch who is sunk in the "sleepy drench" of laziness; and, in our present state, the practical fall of man is his fall from a worker into an idler. However much our desire may be for ease, our real happiness is in activity; yet the difficulty of urging body and mind into effort is so great that the ideal of many working people is still inactive enjoyment—an ideal which their very nature makes impossible of realization. How many men there are, farmers, mechanics, merchants, lawyers, who labor vigorously, looking forward hopefully to the time when the results of their labor will enable them to be loafers!

The thought, indeed, is carried beyond the present life. Miss Marsh, in one of her novels, tells us of a British "navvy" saying to his mate: "I wonder, Bill, whether it be true what they say of heaven being so happy—whether it can be happier than sitting here in the public over a jug of ale, with the fiddle going? I don't know a pleasure as comes up to that!" And by how many persons higher in the mental and moral scale than this navvy is Paradise conceived of as a state in which there is an everlasting continuance of pious laziness,—as if the worst impiety, in heaven as on earth, was not slothful inaction!

But man, being, as I have said, essentially an active being, he must find in activity his joy as well as his duty and glory. And labor, like everything else that is good, is its own exceeding great reward. It is sanitary. Guizot, the great French statesman, said at a meeting of his friends: "After my sudden downfall, in February, 1848, I resolved to drown my grief by hard work. I preserved myself, as it were, in hard work; and it made me again wonderfully hale, active, and vigorous." "Every man's task," says Emerson, "is his life-preserver." Remember that, and you will never fret at unremunerated, unrecognized, unrecorded, even unbelieved-in toil. The moment, indeed, the first indisposition to labor is overcome by personal effort, the power to work gradually grows into a habit of working, until at last the exercise of will becomes instinctive and almost automatic. The man possesses his appetites, passions, and intelligence, and is not, like the loafer, possessed by them. He is the master, and not the slave, of his belongings. By continued effort he obtains the manliest of all feel-

ings, the feeling of personal efficiency, and he thus not only gets a living but gets *life*. The result of his labor may not be the acquisition of any great amount of wealth or any extended stores of knowledge, but it will surely be an integrity of character without which wealth is as poor as poverty and knowledge as blind as ignorance. Only let him start with the truth that labor of some kind is a good in itself, independent of its success in obtaining the object desired, and he will never think his time has been wasted because his ambition has been thwarted. He will find that he has been building up *himself*, though the airy edifice of his hopes may have tumbled into "cureless ruin," and that he is more man than he was, though less rich or famous than he counted on being.

Now, of all nations in the world, the United States should be the most intolerant to loafers and the most hospitable to laborers, from whatever land they come. Our country is, and is to be, the great field of the laborer, for its undeveloped natural resources exceed those of all other countries, and it needs the work of every head and hand, of every soul and body, in its wide domain. Our mission is to educate men for work, and not for the shirking of work. Whatever may be said of us, let it never be said that we are a loafing nation. Loafing nations are those in which the customs, habits, religion of a people invite misgovernment, and misgovernment reacts on the national character further to enfeeble and deprave it. India is a loafing nation; her chief religion, Brahminism, is simply loafing spiritualized, and her population of a hundred and fifty millions is held in subjection by a handful of English soldiers and civilians in consequence of the fact that, like the poor mother of little Paul Dombey, she will not, or cannot, "make an effort." Turkey is a loafing nation. Whole provinces which now, under Ottoman rule, are sterile and poor, were formerly among the richest dependencies of the Roman Empire; and Turkey is "the sick man" of European diplomacy because Turkey is a synonyme of arrogant laziness, superstition, and ignorance. Spain is a loafing nation—a nation ruined by a series of loafing monarchs and loafing prime ministers, of loafing tyrants and no less loafing liberals, and exhibiting what remains to it of political life only in spasms of insurrection, which lead to few or no results in good government.

Our "poor whites" at the South have long enjoyed the reputation, as a body, of thinking it more honorable to loaf than to

labor. It was at first feared that the negroes would also aspire to the honors of loaferdom when they were emancipated, but that fear has been happily dispelled by experience; and, indeed, it was hardly reasonable to predict that the race which had done nearly all the work of the South would become idlers the moment they were offered wages for working.

In strong contrast to the loafing are the laboring nations. Compare Turkey, for example, with Holland or Belgium. Holland has been won from the sea at an expense in diking of some fifteen hundred millions of dollars; its territory is only about 12,000 square miles, or less than half of the area of South Carolina; and yet it supports a population of three millions and a half. Its fens, bogs, and sandy heaths have been converted by industry and thrift into fertile fields and smiling meadows, and the revenue of the kingdom is forty-five millions of dollars. Belgium, with an area of about 12,500 square miles, a population of five millions, a revenue of thirty millions, is really a mere sandbank, which the labor of its inhabitants has transformed into the garden of Europe. Both countries have been repeatedly devastated by wars of long duration, and each is now burdened with the expense of an army as large in proportion to its population as that of France or Austria. The Turkish Empire in Europe and Asia is over 600,000 square miles in extent, includes provinces of immense natural fertility, is rich in every element of wealth which nature can lavish on ungrateful man; and yet it cannot support, in squalor and ignorance, a seventh part of the population to the square mile of territory which Belgium and Holland support in comparative comfort and intelligence. So much for the difference between a nation that loafs and a nation that labors!

But while there is little danger that our country will descend to the level of Turkey and Spain, we can still draw many lessons of skill, industry, and economy from Belgium and Holland. The peculiar advantage of American labor is that, owing to the immense extent and exhaustless undeveloped resources of the country, population here does not press on subsistence as it does on the most industrious European countries. Our population is but little more than the population of Great Britain and Ireland; but the area of Great Britain and Ireland is only 125,000 square miles, while the area of the United States is 3,480,000 square miles, without counting in Walrussia. The coal regions of the

United States alone cover a space larger by 100,000 square miles than the whole area of the United Kingdom, and yet the latter mines four times more millions of tons of coal a year than we do. But it is evident that the natural resources of Great Britain have a limit, while ours are practically unlimited.

The difficulty with England, as compared with this country, is its restricted area. Population there has increased with the increase of wealth, and it has no outlet but in emigration. The connection of this increased population with the progress of mechanical invention is quite striking. The England of Elizabeth, the England of Shakespeare, Bacon, Spenser, Raleigh, and Sidney, the England of the year 1600, contained less than four millions of people. In 1801 it contained a little more than nine millions of people. In 1861 it contained 20,228,497 people, its population more than doubling in sixty years. The England of Elizabeth had about the population of the State of New York; the England of Victoria has two-thirds of the population of the United States. The area of territory is the same, namely, 58,600 square miles—less by about 8,000 square miles than that of the State of Missouri. It is the labor and inventive genius of her people which enable her to support four times the population that she did when she was called "merrie England."

But the special increase of her population from 1801 to 1861, amounting to eleven millions, and the increase in national wealth which such an increase in population implies, were not due to the wisdom of her statesmen or the skill of her generals,—not to Pitt, Fox, Grenville, Liverpool, Wellington, Canning, Grey, Russell, Palmerston; but to the genius of her inventors and engineers,—to Watt, Arkwright, Hargreaves, Bramah, Maudsley, Brindley, Davy, Cartwright, and Stephenson,—who created wealth faster than statesmen and generals could destroy it. In ancient times such men would have been deified; now the historian honors them with less space than he devotes to a Parliamentary debate or to a description of a skirmish; and the capitalist who thrives by them is apt to be of the opinion of that wealthy ironmonger who told Dr. Percy, in reference to inventors, that "brains were more abundant than capital, and ought therefore to be had cheap."

Now, the inventors I have mentioned, and their successors, have added to the productive force of England an amount of mechanical power which is equivalent to the manual labor of

five hundred millions of men; so that, if you should compute the labor-doing machines as laborers, you might say that the England of Elizabeth had a population of four millions, and the England of Victoria a population of five hundred and twenty millions, as, in addition to the twenty millions that are to be lodged, fed, clothed, and educated, there are five hundred millions that only require for food a little coal, that can lodge by the ten thousand in one little room, and whose education consists in the contrivances of their human overseers to double or treble their working capacity. Much as has been said regarding the misery of the English working classes, it must still be admitted that England supports twenty millions of people in more comfort than she supported nine millions in 1800 and four millions in 1600. The poorer classes are not indebted for their poverty altogether to the low rate of wages; the low rate of morals has its share in it.

Still, I would not underrate the poverty of English workmen, owing to the pressure of population on subsistence. But suppose that England, with only the population she had two hundred years ago, had the mechanical aids and agencies of the present century. That is about our condition, and that gives the American laborer a peculiar, an unparalleled, advantage over his brethren of the old world. All the inventions of the past serve him; all the best inventive wits of the present time are contriving, night and day, new machines to supplement or supplant his roughest toil, and to demand more and more work from his brain and less and less from his muscles. He is a citizen of a country in which unskilled labor is better remunerated than the skilled labor of Europe; and skilled labor, as a general thing, is better paid than the labor of the majority of lawyers, doctors, and clergymen. The only fear is that competition will not here be sufficiently active to be educational; for it is the amount of mind which a man puts into his work which determines its dignity and its value; and to stimulate an unskilled workman with the ambition to be a skilled one should be the first object of our popular institutions. That handicraftsman, says Smiles, "whose heart is in his calling, feels as much honest pride in turning out a piece of thoroughly good workmanship as the sculptor or painter does in executing a statue or a picture." When the artisan has thus the feeling of the artist, he finds in his work his

recreation and his joy; and he shows also that he is on the road which has been travelled by the great inventors and heroes of industry.

We may, I suppose, take it for granted that, whatever may be the laws, and however our American society may be organized, there will always remain in some hands a certain portion of the products of labor not devoted to the reproduction of wealth. The way this should be spent is often curtly decided by the maxim that a man has a right to do what he pleases with his own. Well, what a man will do with his own will depend somewhat on his understanding of the word happiness. There was once a hard-working blacksmith who was so *un*lucky as to draw a prize of $20,000 in a lottery. Immediately leaving his work, he threw himself into that vortex of vicious dissipation which is ironically styled "having a good time"; but just as the good time had brought him to death's door, his money was fortunately exhausted. Returning to his old occupation and frugal habits, he recovered his health and his spirits. Soon after, as chance would have it, he drew another prize. "Oh, bother the luck!" he exclaimed, in the greatest trepidation; "have I got to go through all that thing again?" This story is representative. Those who draw the prizes of life are but too apt to spend tastelessly when they do not spend viciously. Their money goes for wine, dogs, and horses; for upholstery as ugly as it is gorgeous; for houses which make good the Frenchman's epigram, that the genius of architecture has shed her malediction on America. They have not learned that it requires as much talent to spend as to make money; that wealth and leisure are only valuable as means of education and refinement; that the best investments a man can make are investments in intelligence and beneficence; that an artistic sense should guide the expenditure of surplus income, and that it should be expressed in pictures and statues, in good music, in good books, in good charities, in houses designed according to some law of beauty, in furniture showing some perception of the elegant and the appropriate.

In doing what he pleases with his own, a man should look out to find no pleasure in expensive deformity, and while he works with his active capital he should not loaf with his inactive wealth. All good things in the fine arts tend to react on industry by elevating it or elevating the man; and all exercise of the mind and

sentiments in the cultivation of taste, the acquisition of knowledge, and the appreciation of what is beautiful and good, is but a finer kind of work. Any young lady will tell you that her French, her Italian, her music, her behavior, in short, her general power to please, came from her power to toil. Indeed, what are called accomplishments, whether in man or woman, are the spoils of strenuous exertion; and they are only bad when they degenerate into dilettantism, which is but another name for artistic loafing.

This antithesis between loafing and laboring might be extended so as to include all the departments of activity over which intellect holds dominion, comprising generalship, statesmanship, literature, science, and art. The act of thought by which the general selects his enemy's weak point, by which the statesman seizes his opportunity, by which the poet creates, the savant discovers, the artist combines, is the culmination of about the hardest work done on the planet—the work of creative genius.

Strong and quick intelligence, indeed, is the result of the vital assimilation of large acquisitions into mental faculties; and it was the oversight of this fact which caused the typical bright young man "who went off to make his fortune out of his wits" to fail "for want of capital." Buffon, the great naturalist, who had, says Saint-Beuve, "the soul of a sage in the body of an athlete," who said of himself that he had passed fifty years of his life at his writing-table, and who thought it an imputation on his intellectual character that another should understand what he could not understand himself, defined genius as patience—that is, the capacity of continuous labor, "unhasting" but "unresting." Sixteen hours of work a day were as little to him and to Cuvier as they were to Agassiz. In literature we can instinctively distinguish an author's works from his loafings, the clear sky of his mind from its muggy weather.

Napoleon, for example, was a prodigious toiler, though the rapidity with which he worked gave to his labor the appearance of inspiration. What we call his flashes of genius, what we call his intuitive glance, came from his previous mastery of all the principles and minutest details relating to the business before him; came from the fierce energy of will which carried him through masses of drudgery from which ordinary industry would

have shrunk appalled. His victories were won in his mind before they occurred in the field.

Among our own generals, Sheridan, in the recent Civil War, made his great mark on the public mind by the impression he conveyed of ceaseless activity of body and soul. He seemed to be a thought on horseback, that toil could not fatigue nor bullets hit, with the power to flash its own ardor and intelligence through the ranks of the army it led. As vigilant as he was audacious; as skilful as he was intrepid; with his mind intently fixed on the business he had to do, and determined to do it, obstacles quickened rather than dismayed his intellect, and seeming hopelessness of success only stimulated his exhaustless fertility of contrivance. He was considered to be rash merely because there was no pause between his swiftly-conceived plan and swiftly-delivered blow, because the brain that thought was in such direct communication with the arm that smote. He knew that he might be killed, but he had that in him which he felt could not be defeated. As he was riding with his escort,—not with the melodramatic celerity we are accustomed to believe, but with the usual pace of some six miles an hour,—as he was riding, I say, from Winchester to Cedar Creek on that memorable morning when he was "twenty miles away," he quietly remarked to Colonel Alexander, as the reports of the disaster to his army came pouring in: "I am determined to regain that field before nightfall, or lie on it." And at Five Forks, in the great closing battle of the war, his mind was so intent on his work that he appeared to be entirely unconscious that he had a body subject to be pierced by a ball or shattered by a shell.

An inspiration to the faltering, a greater terror to the cowardly than the enemy from whom they desired to fly, he was not only the bravest of the brave, but the most skilful of the skilful; and his perceptions were as keen, his judgment as true, his thinking as just, while giving his orders in the midst of that tempest of bullets, as they would have been had no danger to his person interfered with the calm working of his mind. I might contrast such a laboring commander with some of the loafing generals of the war, but, happily for them, they are already forgotten, and their names wake no echoes, even of shame and scorn.

Moral loafing is the characteristic of a large class of people, whose understandings assent to the truth of moral laws, whose sympathies are slightly stirred in admiration of the beauty of moral conduct, and whose hearts feel a certain indignation at the spectacle of rascality, baseness, and oppression, but who still have no moral *verve* and might. To get such persons thoroughly on fire with moral energy is like attempting to light wet wood with newspapers. They find a lazy enjoyment in harmonizing their opinions with what is noble and just; but it is moral self-indulgence they are after, not moral self-sacrifice. They loaf for great causes, not labor for them. Their sympathies, thus divorced from action, soon become misdirected and unwholesome. If they take a languid interest, for example, in any large plans of criminal reform, it gradually degenerates into a morbid pity for the criminal, in which they lose all horror of crime.

In a letter written by John Randolph to Josiah Quincy, Randolph says: "We are so full of the ass's milk of human kindness that we shall soon learn to speak of Judas Iscariot as an *unfortunate* man." This ass's milk is now consumed at too many philanthropic tea-tables, and "iniquitous" makes desperate attempts to pass itself off as a synonpme of "unfortunate." Jefferson Davis was an "unfortunate" rebel; Wilkes Booth, an "unfortunate" assassin. There are some hearts that instinctively feel for the arrested criminal rather than for his plundered or murdered victim. Duncan being in his grave and "sleeping well," all their benevolence is extended to poor Macbeth, whose repose, they hear, is troubled with bad dreams, and whose waking hours are vexed with strange "sights."

But in the moral laborer sympathies have passed into the intellect as principles, and into the conscience as motives, to come out through the will as acts. True philanthropy demands hard, rugged, uncomfortable, distasteful drudgery. It seizes on the real evils of the country, evils which are obstructing its progress, weakening its character, brutalizing its manners, poisoning its soul, and it declares on them open war. It is alert, sagacious, persisting, indefatigable, intrepid, pouring incessantly into the national life its stream of moral influences. It amazes the moral loafer by its inextinguishable ardor in the pursuit of homely, practical ends. Coleridge, a loafing man of genius, whose mind was especially hospitable to theological questions, once wondered if

Clarkson, in his untiring efforts against the slave trade, had ever found time to think of the salvation of his soul. The idling amateur theosophist did not appear to reflect that Clarkson was saving his own soul by devoting his life to the salvation of others —that heaven is on earth with every heroic philanthropist who, while on earth, is engaged in fighting hell.

Finally, we must remember that it is moral labor which reacts on all other labor, by giving that increased force to the will on which all labor ultimately depends. Even in the matter of industrial production, its great enemies all over the world are indolence, improvidence, insobriety, dishonesty, perversity, as its stout supports are frugality, forethought, temperance, integrity, obedience to duty. Every man would have enough and to spare if the loafers would turn laborers, and, instead of being a burden on the community, should add to its wealth. Shiftlessness, laziness, and rascality lay the most grinding of all taxes on industry and rectitude. They do not merely represent that pauperism of body which can be stowed away in almshouses, but that wider pauperism of soul, that willingness to depend for support on the exertions of others instead of their own, which withdraws millions from the producing classes by killing in them the producing disposition and faculty. Now, such persons may be said to *exist*, but they cannot be said to *live*, for there is not much difference between "to be and not to be" until To Be has passed into To Do!

E. P. WHIPPLE.

A NEW VARIETY OF MUGWUMP.

BY THE HON. DORMAN B. EATON, FORMERLY PRESIDENT OF THE CIVIL-SERVICE COMMISSION.

MR. CLARKSON, for eighteen months an Assistant Postmaster-General under President Harrison, in an article entitled "The Politician and the Pharisee," in the May number of this REVIEW, has labored hard to redeem the politician and discredit the Mugwump, but has succeeded only in presenting a new species of Mugwump.

The article condemns the national administration. It arraigns the President and his cabinet for not making more removals. It makes the politician and the *boss* the only patriots. It threatens the Republican party with ruin in 1892 unless it shall adopt the theories of these new Mugwumps. It misconceives and misrepresents the first century of our national history. It echoes the voice of the defeated Senator from Kansas by sneering at reform and representing all reformers as canting hypocrites. It makes the Pharisee the representative, not only of the old Mugwumps, but of all citizens above the mere politician and the partisan. It declares, without warrant, that these citizens discourage interest in political affairs, when, in truth, they have been most active in such affairs, and their efforts have caused more study, discussion, and scrutiny of the methods and theories of government and parties than ever before took place in our history. It invites the enlightened readers of this REVIEW to approve those most responsible for the political barbarism of expelling probably 20,000 postmasters from their places in eighteen months, and to condemn the President and his cabinet, who had the wisdom to arrest such disastrous proscription. The article appeals to those readers to aid the new Mugwumps in making supreme the power of the politicians under whose sway the scandalous scenes of those months would become the constant and intolerable condition of our politics.

In an article so ambitious we naturally expect to find not only some explanation on those points, but some sensible, or at least some definite, views upon the striking tendencies of public sentiment within its scope and at the time before us. We look for them in vain. Few things, for example, are so striking in our politics as the rapid growth and majestic power of public opinion, as contrasted with mere party opinion. Yet our author apparently takes no note of public opinion as a political force, party opinion, in his view, being universal and supreme. The increased influence of the independent or non-partisan press of the country —now so overshadowing the mere partisan journals as to make many of them contemptible—is one of the hopeful wonders of our time. Party contests are in large part but efforts to win this public opinion. This it is which mere politicians most dread and least understand. For nearly a generation public opinion has been growing stronger and stronger, as rapidly as mere party opinion has been growing weaker and weaker, as a political force. Why did not our author tell us how all this has happened? It is absolutely necessary to comprehend public opinion before we can understand how civil-service reform has steadily advanced despite the opposition of mere party opinion and politicians.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, or any other of first rank, would sink in hopeless ruin in a year—as would the Republican party itself—if it should adopt the new party politics of Mr. Clarkson's article. He has come into its columns to appeal to the favor of that overmastering, non-partisan public opinion which he dreads, and which he knows no mere party publication can reach. If he believed party journals and party opinion were the dominating force, why did he make his appeal beyond them? Unfortunately for his cause, he did not comprehend that it was as needful to abandon the arguments, the threats, and the sophistries of the mere politicians as to go outside of their journals; and as a consequence, we must believe, he has repelled rather than convinced his readers. He has advanced a theory of the early years of the republic as repugnant to every chapter of its history as the mere politician was offensive to its statesmen.

The only explanation he offers of the increasing power of public opinion and of the non-partisan press is that the powerful independent journals have been bought up—that is, bribed—to abandon the Republicans and support the Democrats; certainly an

astonishing charge to be made without the least proof. Is it really believed that scores of editors of Republican journals are so corrupt as to thus betray their party? that scores of thousands of intelligent Republican readers are so ignorant or so depraved that they can be thus transferred to the ranks of their opponents by the mere treachery of such editors?

Another great problem passed over in silence is the reason why the movement and the law of 1883 for the reform of the civil service have been all the while steadily gaining strength, and were never so effective as at this moment. The article is to the last degree hostile to both. The reformers are ranked by it in the lowest grade of the Pharisees. The politicians, whom it eulogizes as models of virtue and mighty in power, have constantly but vainly opposed both the law and its execution. Why has this opposition so ignominiously failed? What is the source of the irresistible power demanding reform?

While in a vague way many indefensible opinions and purposes are charged or insinuated against the supporters of this reform, its essential principles are nowhere met by argument, and there is not so much as an attempt to answer the evidence of its great usefulness, which has commanded the support of every administration and every Congress, whether Democratic or Republican. The Republican politicians were certain it would fail when the Democrats succeeded to power; yet they increased its scope. Why did our author evade this great issue? He was called upon to explain such facts in consistency with his theories. He has not so much as attempted a denial of the great facts that the reform has brought more competent officers into the public service, has been highly favorable to education and manly character, has greatly diminished the sphere and evil of office-seeking, has increased the efficiency of every office to which it has been applied, has put most salutary checks upon congressional patronage-mongering.

That it condemns and largely prevents the prostitution of the appointing power for mere party ends, and the establishment of partisan despotism under the control of mere politicians and *bosses*, is very certain. It—the merit system of office—has opened the way for young men to come into the public service on the basis of their character and capacity, whatever selfish politicians, whether in Congress or out, may do or say. It largely suppresses

congressional patronage and takes away the spoils of the politicians within the whole range of the examinations, thus giving to honest worth what intrigue and base influence had before largely monopolized. There is far more liberty for removing the unfit under the reform system than there was before; for no vicious partisan influence gave the officer his place or is at hand to keep him in it. By his own merits he won his position; by his good service alone he can keep it, if only spoilsmen in high places can be held in check. No politician will aid him, for the politician aids only his favorites. The merit system is in no way hostile to true parties, but rather favors and strengthens them by relieving them of the demoralizing effects of partisan office-seeking. It opens the way for the free and manly support of great principles, which is the paramount function of a true political party. The merit system tends to increase the freedom of the people to choose all elective and representative officers, from those of towns and villages to the President himself. The charge made by our author that the people's control of local affairs is invaded is a strange delusion. The election of lawmakers, the work of legislation, and the approval and disapproval of bills by the President and governors are the great and true spheres of party action and influence; and with none of these does the reform system interfere. It deals mainly with the abuse of the appointing power and with the invasion of executive functions by venal politicians and patronage-mongering legislators, who therefore hate it.

In Congress and in State legislatures its effect is to discourage and to a large extent arrest the unconstitutional and disastrous interference with executive affairs by legislative officers. To legislators are thus allowed more time and liberty for their true functions, and executive officers are left free to do their work. Both houses of Congress have apparently taken this view of the matter by voting year by year increased appropriations for carrying on the reform. When the new Mugwumps in Congress attacked the reform last winter, they were repulsed most disastrously.

Prior to his election as President, Mr. Harrison had not been very radically committed to this reform. Secretaries Tracy and Noble, perhaps, had hardly favored it. The Postmaster-General was possibly half as hostile to it as our author himself. If the Postmaster-General is not yet as complete a convert to the merit system as the public interest requires that he should be,—and as

we may believe he will some years hence wish he had been,—he at least appears to be very widely separated from his late subordinate. The President and his cabinet have not only sustained, but have extended, the reform. The examinations now cover many more offices than they did when President Harrison was inaugurated—a fact as creditable to himself and his cabinet as it is auspicious for the Republican party. Secretary Tracy, with the courage of his recent convictions, has enforced its principles in several of the navy-yards, and is now extending this application. Secretary Noble has promoted the extension of the merit system to the Indian service. The President himself has enlarged its sphere and suppressed opportunities of evading it. These statesmen obviously believe that by supporting this reform they best serve their country, and also do the most in their power to strengthen their party. They comprehend that public opinion would be shocked and certain ruin would await the Republican party should it now abandon the reform policy it has had the chief part in establishing. There are now more than 32,000 offices beyond the control of scheming politicians and patronage-mongers —offices which can be secured only by public competitive examinations as to capacity and character. More than 86,000 persons have been examined for filling places thus taken out of spoils-system politics and made the rewards of superior merit. It is no wonder that selfish politicians and bosses, who care more for patronage than for principle, are hostile, angry, and alarmed.

The ex-Assistant Postmaster-General, alone among those in high place under the present or any previous Republican administration, has reached different conclusions. This is clearly his right. He may have had considerable justification for his attack on the President, if a stern rejection of ruinous theories can be a justification. But can he fairly ask both houses of Congress, his own party, which has so long supported the reform, the President, and all the members of his cabinet, to come over to his view, on the peril of his heading a rebellious faction of new Mugwumps in the next election? We have some doubts on this point.

And now a few words concerning the new Mugwumps themselves, as presented by their champion. The one specific, essential, and infallible proof of being a Mugwump is the assertion and exercise of the right to criticise one's party, its officers and policy,

Thus tested, the politicians—members of the new faction, if the rebellion has gone so far—whom Mr. Clarkson champions are Mugwumps of the most radical kind. The variation of the new species from the old type is as unmistakable as their specific identity. The old Mugwumps, though they have their faults, insist on keeping party pledges, on making reforms, on raising the standard for office, on obeying the higher sentiments, on having faith in public virtue and independent manhood; and for these reasons they are called idealists, star-gazers, Sunday-school politicians, and the like. The new Mugwumps are very different in these particulars. They arraign presidents and administrations for trying to fulfil pledges. They hate reforms and reformers. They would make office the reward for partisan zeal and vicious work at the elections. They have faith in manipulation and money in politics. They believe in bosses and wish nothing better than mere politicians. The old Mugwumps believe in statesmen who stand above mere politicians; in statesmen who look upon the nation as something superior to any party, and something which every party ought to serve. They believe in parties, not as an end in themselves, but as organizations which may be made effective for the support of great principles, by which the common interests and welfare of a people and a nation may be advanced. They believe in aiding parties, and do aid them so far as they are true to their principles and pledges. Fidelity to principles and usefulness to the country are, in the view of the old Mugwumps, the supreme duty and the sole justification of political parties.

Mr. Clarkson inadvertently bears testimony to the perhaps sometimes excessive efforts of the old Mugwump to make things better; for he says he "first becomes better than his party, and next better than his country." We see no evidence that the new Mugwumps will ever sin in this way.

The new Mugwumps make direct duty to party supreme. They can feel no patriotic obligation that is not to be discharged through working for a party. In setting forth that astounding theory concerning the early days of the republic to which we have referred, it is declared that the patriot tried to make the government better "by working for his party" rather than his country. But there were no parties when the Declaration of Independence was made, when the constitution was framed, or until near the end of Washington's administration. Were there

then no patriotism and no means by which a patriot and statesman could work for his country? Certainly there were statesmen in those times, and it has been generally believed that something was done for the country. At least, a constitution was framed, a national government was organized, the great fundamental laws were enacted, the departments were set to work, the country took its place in the family of nations,—all this without parties and under a President and statesmen who warned us of dangers from party excesses. The plain truths of history, however, do not trouble the new Mugwumps in the least. They have no more place for them than they have for statesmen. The statesman is referred to by their champion as a person whom the detested "Pharisee uses," and to whom the new Mugwump objects, preferring the politician and the boss.

It is certainly possible to use the word politician to designate a statesman, however great the shock such use of it produces. Common use makes him the manager of party politics, the active man in the manipulation of caucuses and conventions, the astute partisan who cares more for victory than for principle, more for his party than his country. As such our author commends him to the youth of the nation as the model patriot. Even the boss himself—the great embodiment of all that is worst in the mere politician—is extolled as hardly less than a saint, a martyr. Incredible as it may seem, these are the words of his eulogist: "He [the boss] does for his party what the class-leader does for his church. . . . He does a work so good and from a motive so pure that money could not hire it done." Such words make us laugh when we are expected to admire. Yet we agree, and rejoice, that money could not hire an honest man to do most of the work done by the boss. Far better that most of it should be left undone. What is greatly needed is much less management, much less party coercion, much less of the work of the boss in our politics, and much more free voting and free acting on the part of the citizen. It is an insult to the best elements of human nature to class mere politicians with the earnest Christian and the self-sacrificing patriot.

Throughout the land—in the churches, charities, and hospitals, and all the manifold organizations for relieving affliction and uplifting society—self-sacrificing men and women nobly labor for the welfare of their country. In all the schools, seminaries, and col-

leges; in all the walks of science, art, and literature; in the innumerable organizations for the advancement and dissemination of knowledge; through books and the public press in all its forms, the higher and most unselfish thought and aspiration of the people make their grand contributions to the intelligence, character, and public opinion of the nation. In nearly every domain of human thought and effort, more largely than in that of party politics, noble and gifted men of original genius make new contributions to the higher influences by which the morality and civilization of nations are moulded and righteous government is upheld. Compared with what springs from such sources to illustrate true self-sacrifice and to make up the higher life, the soul of a nation, all that is contributed by the mere politicians and the bosses is both small and mean indeed.

Yet the expounder of the new Mugwumpism, neglecting all these great elements of national character, tells us that the "soul of the government" is put into it through politics. Religion, morality, statesmanship, as uplifting and creative forces, are unnoticed. There is no apparent conception of the power of public opinion. Party opinion, party men, party discipline, politicians, practical politics, bosses, partisan patronage, offices, the power of appointment and removal—these, according to the new Mugwumps, are what put souls into government, make republics great, determine the destiny of nations, illustrate lofty virtues, deserve the admiration of the young men of this great country. "Every good citizen is a politician," says the champion of new Mugwumpism; therefore every one not a politician is a bad citizen. What a bad citizen Washington must have been!

It is an interesting part of the new Mugwump theories that they claim the town meeting to be the basis and guarantee of the American system of government, with which civil-service reform is utterly incompatible. Now, it is unfortunate for this view that the town meeting originated and has been most developed and best preserved in Massachusetts, the very State which has longest and most widely, and with the most salutary results, enforced that civil-service reform which Mr. Clarkson detests. It has made converts of all parties and their leaders. It is being enforced not merely in the State administration (as generally understood), but in that of the counties, cities, hospitals, asylums, and other public institutions of the State, and even in street-cleaning in Boston.

Wherever these new Mugwump theories refer to definite facts in public affairs, they are confuted and rebuked.

There is no space to set forth the degradation, corruption, and ferocity in our politics which the adoption of the new Mugwump system of universal partisan proscription would cause. No other writer has ever proposed such a system. No government could long stand under it, and none since the republics of Greece and Italy have enforced it. It requires President Harrison to fill all the new judgeships with Republican politicians. The spoils system, which was first accepted by Jackson, and disgraced his administration, was civilization itself compared with the barbarity of this new Mugwumpism. In four years Jackson needed to make hardly two thousand appointments, in the whole public service, to fill all the places which his removals and coercion caused. The enforcement of the new Mugwump system made more appointments than this necessary in four months in a single one of the seven great departments. Men now alive will be living when the country will have more than five hundred thousand postmasters. Fifteen hundred appointments every secular day for a whole year would not meet the demands of the new Mugwumps in the matter of post-offices alone, to say nothing of the vast numbers of other offices. Does any sane man think republican government could long stand such a strain ?

Heretofore the most audacious and unscrupulous advocates of a partisan spoils system have tried to justify it as useful to the country. We now have it demanded in the name of the people, to gratify the "pride" of a victorious party, as Roman consuls demanded triumphs and sacrifices to gratify the pride and revenge of brutal, victorious legions. These are the astounding words : "They believe in changes . . . for the public good . . . *and also from a sense of party pride*"! After all the removals that the public good requires are completed, how many thousands should be added to gratify the savagery of party pride ? The celebrated declaration of Marcy about the victors and the spoils is reason and moderation compared with this savage theory of removals to gratify party pride. It would disgrace the republican system and the American name even in the half-civilized countries of Asia. Could anything be more disgusting and contemptible in the next presidential campaign than a faction of Republicans avowing such a policy and seeking such a consummation ?

To even compromise with such a faction would defeat any party. If such a faction takes the field, it should have for its platform an execution-block, on its flags a skull and bones, and for the baton of its boss an Australian boomerang or an Indian tomahawk.

We have no space for dealing with the preposterous claim that our early national history lends sanction to this new Mugwumpism. Nothing analogous to its party theories can be found in the national administration of the first half-century. They are as repugnant to the spirit of the early statesmen as Christianity is to heathenism. Jefferson, on succeeding a Federal President, made less than fifty removals, and he deprecated them as a necessity. In the whole forty years from Washington's election to that of Jackson there were less than a hundred removals for party reasons—not so large a number as were lately made on many single days in a single department, in trying to meet the insatiable demands of our new Mugwumps. The whole claim made that our constitution provides for party government and mere party responsibility rests on an utter misconception of its provisions. Such a government, of which that of England is the best example, requires that the victorious party should be able to control not only the executive department, but both branches of the legislature. No such result follows our elections. The President may be of one party, the Senate of another, and the House even of a third. Laws and policies must be the result of the agreement of the three, and hence much more than a mere party responsibility and control was clearly contemplated. It was plainly intended that a powerful and all-pervading public opinion should force all three branches of the government and all parties into allegiance to reason and duty. To make possible the kind of administration which this new Mugwumpism demands, we must not only repudiate the best precedents of the nation, but frame for it a new constitution.

DORMAN B. EATON.

THE INHERITANCE OF PROPERTY.

BY PROFESSOR RICHARD T. ELY, OF JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

THE chief modern industrial problem is often stated to be the distribution of property. What is wanted is widely-diffused property, and it is desired to bring about this wide diffusion without injustice, and without injury to the springs of economic activity.

Many proposals are brought forward which aim to produce a more general prosperity. Two of the best-known are the single tax and socialism. These, however, apart from all other considerations, encounter the strongest obstacles to their introduction because they are so averse to powerful private interests. Wise social reform will always seek for the line of least resistance. It is granted that the end proposed by socialism and the single tax is desirable in so far as it contemplates a wide distribution of wealth ; but before committing ourselves to any extreme doctrines it is well to ask, What can be done without radical change ?—in other words, what can we accomplish in order to ameliorate the condition of the masses without departure from the fundamental principles of the existing social order ? When we reflect upon it, we find that there are many things, and that these are quite sufficient to occupy the thoughts and energies of well-wishers of their kind for a long time to come. At the present time I feel inclined to classify the chief things required to bring about an improved condition of society in the United States under three heads, namely :

First—Education in its broadest sense, including kindergartens, manual training, technical schools, colleges, and universities.

Second—The abolition of private monopoly, and the substitution therefor of public ownership and management of all those en-

terprises which are by nature monopolies, like railways, gas and electric-lighting businesses, telegraphs, telephones, etc.

Third—A reform of the laws of inheritance.

What can be done by a regulation of inheritance to change the distribution of property, and consequently of the opportunities and income which property yields? Once in a generation nearly all property changes owners, and that gives opportunity for bringing about the greatest changes within half a century. There is a perpetual flow of property from the dead to the living, and it is possible by means of law to exercise much influence over this current. When we attempt to bring about reform and improvement by a wise regulation of inheritance, we have a solid basis of experience to help us. One part of such legislation which naturally suggests itself is the taxation of the estates of decedents, and such estates are taxed to a greater or less extent in nearly all—perhaps in all—great modern nations. We may mention England, Australia, New Zealand, and Switzerland as countries with particularly instructive experience in the taxation of inheritances. Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland in the United States have experience which is valuable as far as it goes. Three of the countries named, Australia, New Zealand, and Switzerland, have taxation of inheritances which amounts to a conscious attempt to influence the distribution of property.

Some one may interrupt at this point with the objection, "You are proposing measures which impair the rights of private property." The objection is not valid. The right of inheritance is one right, and the right of private property is another and a distinct right. He has made but little progress in the fundamental principles of jurisprudence who does not see how clearly separated are these two rights. The right of property means an exclusive right of control over a thing, but the right of inheritance means the transfer of this right in one manner or another. If there is no will, it means the right of some one to succeed to property, and this right is a product of positive law. If a will is made, the right of inheritance means, not an exclusive right of control vested in a person, but the right of a person to say who shall exercise the right of property over things which were his while he was living, after he is dead, and, consequently, after he has lost all rights of property, because the dead have no proprietary rights whatever. Blackstone in his "Commentaries on

the Laws of England" clearly discriminates between the rights of property and the rights which we lump together under the designation inheritance. He says :

> "Naturally speaking, the instant a man ceases to be, he ceases to have any dominion : else if he had a right to dispose of his acquisitions one moment beyond his life he would also have a right to direct their disposal for a million of ages after him which would be highly absurd and inconvenient. All property must, therefore, cease upon death, considering men as absolute individuals unconnected with civil society. . . . Wills, therefore, and testaments, rights of inheritance and succession, are all of them creatures of the civil or municipal laws, and accordingly are in all respects regulated by them ; every distinct country having distinct ceremonies and requisites to make a testament completely valid ; neither does anything vary more than the right of inheritance under different national establishments."

Blackstone says it is an erroneous principle to suppose that "the son has by nature a right to succeed to his father's lands," or that the owner "is by nature entitled to direct the succession of his property after his own decease."

The right of private property in itself is not an unlimited one, but is limited and regulated to an increasing extent by all modern nations. Let one but think what this right implies. It implies, among other things, my right to fence in a certain portion of the earth's surface, and to exclude others from it and use it as I see fit, subject only to such general regulations as may exist to prevent the abuse of private property. These regulations, however, as they are general in character, must always leave untouched many gross abuses. But when we come to the claim that my right of disposing of property by last will and testament is practically unlimited, it means not only my right to regulate the use of certain portions of the earth's surface, or claims to certain portions of other valuable things in this earth, during my lifetime, but for all future time. There are those, indeed, who go so far as to hold that a man may establish certain regulations for the use of property after he is dead and gone, and that these regulations must be binding upon all future generations. Could any claim be more monstrous ? It is in itself the extremest radicalism. We may say, in fact, that it is the furthest reach which radicalism has yet attained.

Nothing illustrates better the changing ideas and practices concerning inheritance than this right to make a last will and testament. Sir Henry Maine, in his "Village Communities," says : "The power of free testamentary distribution implies the greatest latitude ever given in the history of the world to the voli-

tion or caprice of the individual." The right of making a will is one which has not been generally recognized, it is safe to say, during the greater part of the world's history. Probably the vast majority—say, as a rash guess, nineteen-twentieths—of the human beings who have ever lived have not known this right. There is a legal maxim of the old Teutonic law which prevailed among our ancestors to the effect that "God, not man, makes heirs." This old Teutonic law provided that a man's property should pass to his family, and this he could not prevent if he would. This has been the most common regulation of inheritance. The Roman law brought in the right of free testamentary disposition of property; a development of individualism in keeping with many other parts of this law. The Roman law, however, had no sooner established the right of a man to dispose of his property by will and testament than it began to limit this right, and to make these limitations more and more far-reaching. The experience of other countries has been similar. No sooner do we come near an unlimited right of disposing of property by last will and testament than we begin to beat a retreat.

The modern man thinks it a right thing in itself that he should be able to tell what shall become of his property after his death, but millions of human beings have lived and died who have thought it a thing right in itself that the laws of inheritance should exclude the right to make a will. This merely illustrates the changing, fluctuating ideas concerning inheritance. In the States of the American Union for some time after our Revolutionary War, the right of the eldest son to receive a double portion of his father's estate obtained, and it was spoken of as "being according to the law of nature and the dignity of birthright." As a matter of fact, the laws of inheritance direct the disposition of most property, and they gradually so form our opinions that we look upon what they provide as naturally right, although they provide one thing in one country or state, and another thing in another country or state. It has been said that even when wills are made in modern times they as a rule do little more than carry out the provisions of the law. Perhaps there is no department of life in which law has a greater effect upon public opinion.

If it is the function of the law to regulate inheritance, what should be the purpose of the law? We may say that the law has three purposes. The first is to gratify the desire of the individ-

ual to direct the disposition of his property after his death. This, however, is altogether minor and subordinate. The dead have no legal rights, and we should not allow their wishes to interfere with the living. The second purpose of the law is the chief one, and that is the preservation and security of the family. The third purpose is the welfare of society in general ; and under this head we may say that the preservation of small properties is important, and that the idea of justice which demands that a person should make a fair return for that which he receives is one which ought to be kept in view.

Let us consider briefly the family. The Rev. Samuel W. Dike, who has made the study of the family as a social institution a specialty, complains that our laws neglect to treat the family as such, and to provide for its welfare. This is true. The modern legislator does not stop to ask the effect of proposed measures upon the family as an institution. Frequent divorces, of which we hear so much, are only one manifestation of this general neglect, the fruit of radical individualism. We have done one thing in the United States thoroughly,—we have made careful provision for the rights of the wife in the property of her husband. The law generally provides that the wife shall inherit a third, or the use of a third, of the husband's estate, and no will can lessen the wife's legal share. This is a far-reaching limitation of the right of making a will. But even when providing for the wife, the legislator seems to have regarded her rather as an individual than as a part of the family. Some States, like New York, make no adequate provision for the husband of a wife with property, allowing her to disinherit the husband, and, under certain circumstances, if she dies and leaves no will, the property will go to cousins rather than to the husband.

There has been nowhere in the United States adequate provision for children, although it might be supposed that their claims would be superior even to the claims of a wife. A wife enters into relation with her husband when she is an adult, freely and voluntarily ; but children have no choice about the relationship into which their parents bring them. The laws of some countries provide that a child must receive a certain share of the estate of a parent, and that this cannot be willed away. This share is called in the Roman law "*legitima portio*,"—legitimate part,—but the German law has a better designation for it,

"*Pflichttheil*"—duty part. The laws of France provide that a father with children may will away only what would be a child's share of his estate, and that the rest must be divided equally among all the children. The details of the law may vary, but it is contrary to the fundamental principles of the law to neglect to provide for children in the laws of inheritance. Those who are responsible for having brought children into the world may not presume to disinherit them. A parent's duty is to do all in his power to give his children the training and opportunities which will enable them to lead happy and useful lives. It is not desirable that children should be placed in such a position that self-exertion is rendered needless. I should say that in the United States the "duty part" of a child of even the richest parent need not exceed fifty thousand dollars, and that so far as the rest of the estate is concerned, after providing for wife and children, and after satisfying the claims of the State, that should be left subject to free disposition.

When no will is made, the rule according to which property is divided among wife and children in this country is, perhaps, tolerably satisfactory ; but suppose a man dies making no will, and has only collateral relatives : what should be their legal claim upon the estate ? The modern laws which provide that even distant relatives may inherit the property of intestates are survivals of an earlier period, when large family groups lived together and formed a kind of a family partnership under the authority of the patriarch. When a man died under such circumstances, it was only natural that his property should pass to the family or the clan, itself but a larger family, for all were united together by the ties of interest and affection. There was a correspondence between rights and duties. But what is the case at the present time ? The peculiar ties which bind together distant relatives are practically unworthy of consideration. Rights and duties ought to be coördinate, but distant relatives recognize no special duties towards one another, and do not think about their common relationship unless there is some property to be inherited from a distant rich relative, for whom they care nothing. In the absence of a will, there is positively no reason whatever why any one should inherit from a third cousin. The family reason does not cover the case, because family feeling does not in our day extend so far, and, indeed, there is no reason why it should.

The right of inheritance, so far as relatives are concerned, should reach as far as the real family feeling does, but no farther. Intestate inheritance should include, perhaps, those who are nearly enough related so that they can trace descent from a common great-grandfather, but none who are more distantly related. This allows second cousins to inherit from one another, but not third. It allows that one may inherit from a great-uncle, but not from a great-great-uncle, and so forth. Any provision for a more distant relative should be made by will, just the same as provision for any one who is not related at all. All property which is not willed away, and does not fall to some heir recognized by law, should fall to the state as the ultimate heir.

The right of disposing of property by will and testament may be left intact—and should be so left in the public interest—with the limitations already mentioned and to be mentioned presently. After all legally-recognized claims are satisfied, it is beneficial rather than otherwise to allow a person to dispose of the rest of his estate by will, although it should be clearly recognized that this is a matter over which the law has control, and that no human being has a right to say what shall take place on this earth, or what use shall be made of anything he may leave, after he is dead and gone. It may very well happen that there are persons with moral claims upon a man who are not connected by ties of blood, or not nearly enough related to inherit property according to the laws of intestate inheritance. The only way to make provision for such special cases which justice or gratitude may point out is by will. It may also happen that among the legal heirs there may be a particular reason why one should be selected as the recipient of more than a proportionate share of the property. Take the case of four or five brothers, one of whom is a cripple, the others being strong, active, and capable: what could be more just than that the unfortunate one should receive a larger share than the others? It may also happen that of three or four daughters one has married a poor man and the others wealthy men, and the father may see good reason for equalizing their conditions. A thousand-and-one cases arise in daily life for which individual provision must be made, as they do not fall under the general rule and the law cannot provide for them. Persons of means may also properly enough leave property to educational and charitable institutions. The right to

dispose of a portion of property by will tends to the encouragement of energy and thrift.

All inheritances of every sort should be taxed, provided the share of an heir exceeds a certain amount. The state or the local political unit—as town or city—must be recognized as a co-heir entitled to a share in all inheritances. A man is made what he is by family, by town, or the local political circle which surrounds him, and by the state in which he lives, and all have claims which ought to be recognized. Taxation of inheritance is the means whereby this claim of the state and town may secure recognition. It should, however, be borne in mind that it is a peculiar tax, and rests upon a different basis from the ordinary tax. The justification which appeals to me most strongly is that the political organisms are co-heirs. There are, however, many different stand-points from which the taxation of inheritances can be justified. Property which comes by inheritance is an income received without toil. It is for the one receiving it an unearned increment of property, and on this account may properly be taxed. The most satisfactory basis upon which property can rest is personal toil and exertion of some kind, and when property comes otherwise than as a return for social service, a special tax finds a good solid basis in justice.

It generally happens, perhaps universally, that a large property does not pay its fair share of taxes during the lifetime of its owner, and the tax upon estates when their owners die may be regarded—if it is not too large—as a payment of back taxes. It is notorious with us that personal property bears relatively a very small proportion of the burdens of government, and it has been proposed that the ordinary property tax on personal property should be abolished, and that in the place thereof there should be substituted a tax on all estates of decedents in so far as they consist of personal property. These, however, are grounds only for a limited tax, which in the case of personal property ought to be added to the regular inheritance tax, if personal property is otherwise exempted from taxation.

The taxation of inheritances should be graduated, the tax increasing as the relationship becomes more distant, and as the property becomes larger. This is in the line of the present development of taxation of inheritances. The tax rises to 20 per cent. of the estate in some of the Swiss cantons, to 13 per cent.

in New Zealand, and to 10 or 11 per cent. in some other countries. I would have the tax vary from 1 to 20 per cent., establishing 20 per cent. as the maximum; at any rate, until public opinion is more enlightened. Mr. Andrew Carnegie is willing to see a tax-rate of even 50 per cent., and advocates such a high tax on estates of decedents on social grounds. It will probably be a long time before so high a tax would meet with general approval, but we know that a tax of 20 per cent. works well. In the case of near relatives, small amounts inherited by each ought to be entirely exempt from taxation. There is provision in the laws of many countries that small legacies left to servants should be free from taxation, and this, like other provisions recognizing the family, is praiseworthy.

The celebrated Professor Bluntschli, of Heidelberg, laid down these proposals for reform in the laws of inheritance:

First, the share of a child is not to be taxed unless it exceeds $24,000, but of any excess above $24,000 the local political unit (which, for the sake of brevity, we will hereafter call town in every case) shall receive 10 per cent. If the share of a child exceeds $120,000, the state shall receive of the excess above $120,000 a child's share.

Second, if the estate falls to parents or grandparents of the decedent, the town is to receive a share of 5 per cent. of the estate, provided the share of a single ancestor is more than $2,400 but does not exceed $12,000, and 10 per cent. of the excess of a share over $12,000. If the share of a single ancestor exceeds $24,000, the state receives a share equal to 10 per cent. of the surplus.

Third, the brothers and sisters, and children of brothers and sisters, of decedents are to be treated, so far as inheritance goes, like parents and grandparents.

Fourth, if the heirs of the decedent are descended from grandparents, but not from the same parents,—that is to say, if they are cousins, aunts, and uncles,—the town is to be entitled to a share of 10 per cent. of the estate if this exceeds $2,400, and 20 per cent. of the excess of the estate above $12,000. If the estate exceeds $24,000, 20 per cent. of this excess is to go to the state, and not to the town.

Fifth, if the heirs of the decedent are descended from common great-grandparents, but not from common grandparents or

parents, the share of the town is to be 20 per cent. if the estate exceeds $2,400, and 30 per cent. of the excess above $12,000; and if the estate exceeds $24,000, the state is to receive 30 per cent. of this excess.

Sixth, if the decedent has no relatives near enough to be descended from common great-grandparents, the estate is to fall to the town if it does not exceed in value $12,000, but if the value is greater than this, the entire surplus above $12,000 is to fall to the state.

Seventh, if the decedent leaves a husband or wife, the survivor is to have a life interest in the share of the town or state.

Bluntschli proposes that this property acquired by the local political units and the state should be used as a fund to support institutions especially designed to promote the interests of the property-less classes; also that it should be used to reward persons who have distinguished themselves in science or in art, or who have rendered especially valuable service to the poorer classes of society. He is unwilling to allow a diversion by will of that portion of an estate which falls to the town or state, but he is willing to allow a person to direct that that portion which belongs to the town or state as "duty part" (*Pflichttheil*) should be made over to charitable, benevolent, or educational foundations, provided town and state give their approval, and he is also willing that the testator should give survivors a life interest in that part of the estate which must ultimately fall to town or state.

These proposals of Bluntschli seem eminently wise and conservative, and, while it may be desirable to alter them in details, they furnish an excellent basis for discussion.

The use to be made of the funds acquired by the taxation of inheritances, and by establishing the co-heirship of town and state, must vary according to time and place. Bluntschli would have this property used to provide large estates for persons who have rendered signal service to the state. There is precedent enough for this in European states. Bismarck received a fortune after the Franco-Prussian War, and England has conferred fortunes upon great generals. While such a disposition of property to create great and powerful families may, perhaps, be proper enough in Germany, it would be altogether unsuitable for our country. There are, however, many uses which suggest themselves. In cases of cities, towns, and States weighed down with

debt, the payment of bonds would be an excellent employment of the funds. In case taxes are extraordinarily high and are weighing down industry, the tax-rate might be reduced. I think, however, that there are very few places in the United States where a properly-developed tax system would not provide for all present expenditures of government without overburdening any one. But there are great improvements which it is desirable to carry out, and these funds could be used to effect improvements which cost too much to be defrayed out of the ordinary taxation.

The States of the Union, and many of the towns, ought to go into forestry, purchasing large tracts of land, especially on mountains and along river courses, and covering these with trees. States and cities have allowed the ownership of valuable public works to slip away from them into the hands of private corporations. Water-works, gas works, street-car lines, and the like might be purchased and operated at cost. All great cities require a larger number of parks, especially of small parks in the crowded sections. Sanitary measures may be mentioned, and some of these are expensive. They, however, lower the death-rate and improve the health of the community. There are many cities which ought to buy slums and tear down the houses in them. The city of Manchester, England, bought quite a large tract of land in the centre of the city, which was the worst slum region in it, and tore down all the houses. It then leased the land for a limited term of years, to be built up with houses according to plans and specifications laid down. The result has been a remarkable improvement in Manchester, and it is said that, when these leases fall in, Manchester will be one of the richest, if not the richest, municipal corporation in the world. London has recently decided to undertake a similar improvement, but it is stated that in the case of London this will involve great expense.

School funds ought to be increased until they become great enough, with the aid of current taxation, to provide the entire population with the best educational facilities of every sort, including manual training, kindergartens, public libraries, universities, industrial museums, art-galleries, and the like. It would be especially desirable to improve the schools in the rural communities, establishing good high-schools wherever the population is sufficient to furnish them with pupils. Good schools in the country districts would tend to keep people in the country,

for now many leave the country and go to the cities purposely to educate their children. It is on every account desirable to make the country pleasanter and more attractive as a place of abode. Another fund may be suggested as suitable to be accumulated out of property inherited by the State and town, and that would be a highway fund, designed to help to improve the streets and roads of the State. The income of this fund could be distributed to towns and counties in such a manner as to encourage them in the improvement of roads and streets. It might be provided, for example, that for every two or three dollars expended by the local political unit one should be granted from the fund.

I believe the line of reform proposed in this article will stand every test which can be applied to it. It is, as already mentioned, a reform which meets with approval wherever tried, and with increasing approval the longer it is tried. It is a reform especially in keeping with democratic institutions, and it has succeeded best in democratic countries. So perfectly is it in keeping with true democracy that the purer, the more complete, and the more cultured the democratic countries have become in which this reform has been tried, the more they are inclined to move further along the same line. It is entirely compatible with the fundamental principles of the existing social order, and does not interfere with its normal and peaceful evolution. It antagonizes no other line of progress, but helps forward every other true reform. It provides ample public funds when accompanied by a rational system of taxation, and yet lays a burden heavy to be borne on no one.

We may examine this reform of the laws of inheritance with respect to the family, and we find that it tends to the development of the family as an institution far better than the existing laws in the United States. It recognizes the solidarity of the family. The husband is responsible to the wife and the wife to the husband, and both are responsible for the children they have brought into the world. It coördinates rights and duties. It may be stated, however, in this connection that duty should be extended among the various members of a family; in particular the reciprocal duties of parents and children should be sharpened and strengthened. The duty of support—and adequate support in proportion to means—should apply both to parents and to children, parents supporting the children in their youth, and children

the parents in their old age. The various members of the family organism should be drawn together by an extension of duties. It may be questioned whether any one should have the right to inherit from a person provided he may not under any circumstances be called upon to minister to his support. As Emerson and the other great thinkers have long been saying, it is time now to stop talking so much about rights, and to begin to emphasize duties.

If we look at this reform from the stand-point of society, we find that it stands every test to which it can be subjected. It diffuses property widely, and results in a great number of families with an ample competence, and tends to prevent the growth of plutocracy. It is these families with a competence lifting them above a severe struggle for bare physical necessities, which carry forward the world's civilization. It is from these families that the great leaders of men come, and not from either of the two extremes of society, the very rich or the very poor, both of which extremes we wish to abolish. Excessive wealth discourages exertion, but a suitable reform of the laws of inheritance will remove from us many idle persons who consume annually immense quantities of wealth, but contribute nothing to the support of the race; and who, leading idle lives, cultivate bad ideals and disseminate social poison. For the sake of the sons of the rich, as well as for the sake of the sons of the poor, we need a reform of the laws of inheritance.

A reform of the laws of inheritance of property will help us to approach that ideal condition in which the man who does not work shall not eat, and it will also tend to an equalization of opportunities so as to give all a fairer start in life, allowing each one to make such use of his opportunities as his capacity and diligence permit, and thus rendering inequalities, economic and social, less odious and injurious, more stimulating and helpful. This reform tends to make income a reward for service, thus realizing in a higher degree than at present the demands of justice. It must tend indirectly to discourage idleness and to encourage industry, and to repress that gambling, speculative spirit which desires something for nothing, and wants to get a living without rendering an honest return of some kind.

RICHARD T. ELY.

ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.

BY EDWARD A. FREEMAN, LL. D., D. C. L., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

THE English universities are, of all English institutions, those which foreigners find the greatest difficulty in understanding. And the difficulty is by no means confined to foreigners strictly so called. It extends to those who are nearest in blood to the people of England, and nearest in geographical position to the land itself. For the English universities are English in the narrowest local sense of that word. Their constitution, and much in them besides their constitution, is puzzling, not only to the stranger from the European continent, but to the Scottish and Irish subjects of the same crown and to the men of English blood and speech in the lands beyond the ocean. An English university is so different from a Continental, a Scottish, or an American university that those who are used only to the one find it hard to understand the nature of the other. Yet with some of the nations spoken of there is an easy way of piercing through the mystery. A visitor from Switzerland, from Canada, from the United States, ought soon to see his way through everything, if he is once put on the right tack.

The main peculiarity of the English university system, that which those who are not used to it find the main cause of puzzledom, is the existence of many colleges in one university. If I were to say that this is absolutely peculiar to Oxford and Cambridge, I might be met with the answer that more than one French and German university formerly contained several colleges, and that there still are two or more colleges in the Scottish University of Saint Andrew's. But if the Continental instances were really at all like Oxford and Cambridge, they exist no longer to be compared with them, and the colleges at Saint Andrew's differ altogether from the colleges in the English universities.

Practically Oxford and Cambridge stand by themselves; they are institutions singularly like one another in their main outlines, and, at the same time, utterly unlike anything else in the whole world. Each is an university containing many colleges. On the European continent we hear, as a rule, only of universities, not of colleges. In France the word *collége* is often heard, but it means what we should call a school. In America "college" and "university" mean the same kind of institution; only "university" is thought to be the more dignified name. And what either "college" or "university" means is, allowing for difference of circumstances, what an English university would be if colleges had never been founded in it, or if all its colleges should be suppressed. How puzzling the English system is to all who are not used to it is revealed to those who are by not a few signs. I constantly receive foreign—sometimes English—letters addressed to "the university." I have been asked in Europe whether I lived "in the university." The university is supposed to be, as it commonly is in Germany and Italy, a single institution, having its home in a single large building. But the oddest confusion of all was that of an American professor who, in his book of travels in England, ended a fairly accurate description of the several colleges at Cambridge with this remark: "The formal style of Cambridge College is 'The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.'"

But with either an American or a Swiss visitor, with any visitor, in short, who comes from a country with a federal constitution, the way to give him a clearer notion of things is not hard. Tell him that in an English university the university answers to the Union and the colleges to the States, and he at once begins to understand. Tell him that there are certain things which each college can do for itself, and certain other things which only the whole university can do. Tell him that each college, like each State, manages its own affairs and its own property, that each exercises its own discipline over its own members, but that the university, like the Union, has its own range and its own discipline also. Tell him that a single college can no more grant a degree than a single State can coin money or declare war. Let him well take in all this, and he will, in King Harry's phrase, have got the sow by the right ear. Only a warning will be necessary. He must be further told that this

illustration, though practically as near as any illustration is likely to be, is historically false. That is to say, the practical, every-day relation of the university and the colleges is very like that of the Union and the States ; but no one must think that, as the Union is an aggregate of States, so the university is an aggregate of colleges. The university was in being before the colleges, and it would go on, untouched in any material respect, though every college in it were suppressed. The colleges in all things presuppose the university ; they have no object or meaning apart from the university. The university grew up for the promotion of learning ; the colleges were founded in order that certain persons might receive the advantages of the university and its teachings who otherwise might not have attained to them.

The university grew up ; the colleges were founded. That is a point very necessary to notice. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge may, with the most literal truth, say, like Topsy : "Nobody made me ; 'spects I growed." And in truth it is a matter of suspicion. We suspect that the first small beginnings of the growth of the University of Oxford happened in the reign of Henry the First ; but we do not do much more than suspect. We have no certain records. We had a certain Robert Puleyn lecturing in divinity, and a little later we find a more famous Vacarius lecturing in civil law. We naturally suspect that we have here the beginning of two of the great faculties of the university. Before the end of the twelfth century these germs, or some others, had certainly "growed" into a large body of masters and scholars. And in the course of the twelfth century bountiful men began to found colleges in those universities which had thus come into being of themselves. But no man, king or bishop or private person, founded either of the universities. Still less did anybody endow them. Masters began to teach ; scholars came to hear ; and the thing grew up. The whole body of such masters and scholars, like the whole body of any other class of people, was called its "universitas." In the noble Latin rimes of the thirteenth century, which so well set forth the whole doctrine of popular government, we read :

> "Igitur communitas regni consulatur,
> Et quid universitas sentiat sciatur."

Here the "universitas" means the same as the "communitas"—that is, it means nothing short of the whole people of England.

Thus the "university"—that is, simply the whole body—of the masters and scholars of Oxford or Cambridge gradually grew up. We have popular errors to strive against at every step, and the one that has to be striven against just now is the very common belief that the towns of Oxford and Cambridge are something secondary to the universities, and grew up around them. No one is likely to make this mistake about either a German or an American university; but in England it is really very common. How common it is is shown in both houses of Parliament whenever there is any debate about university matters. People see that the town is—or at least was—something quite subordinate to the university, and they fancy that it is something newer than the university, something that grew up because the university was there. They think, if they think at all, that Oxford and Cambridge are like those towns which grew up round some castle or great church, commonly some great abbey. Of such there are many in England, though but few among the greater towns. But the city of Oxford and borough of Cambridge had been in being long before the universities began. Both figure in the wars of the tenth and eleventh centuries, while true history cannot place the feeblest beginning of the universities before the twelfth. Oxford, above all, was one of the most important posts in England. As long as any trace or memory lasted of the old independence of Mercia and Wessex, Oxford, the chief town on the upper course of the boundary stream of Thames, was one of the greatest military and political centres in England. Before the Norman conquest, and long after, Oxford was the chosen place for great national gatherings. And Cambridge, though not of the same historical importance as Oxford, was a strong military post, and a considerable town according to the standard of the time.

The universities, then, arose by masters and scholars settling in existing towns. They did not, as monks sometimes did, sit down under a green tree, and see a town grow round them. The universities grew till they became independent of the towns, and even superior to the towns; but the town and its jurisdiction were the older. And Oxford and Cambridge were towns which were well suited for the growth of such independence on the part of the universities. Oxford, a great place for holding national councils, an occasional dwelling-place of kings, was not, like many other towns, under

the immediate power or influence of any great lord, temporal or spiritual. One great object with the rising university was to be independent of the diocesan bishop, and Oxford was in the vast diocese of Lincoln, whose bishop was far away. At Cambridge the Bishop of Ely was much nearer ; still the masters and scholars were not actually at his gate.

The universities gradually obtained privileges from kings and popes which made them independent of all ordinary jurisdiction, spiritual and temporal. They became great and powerful bodies ; but they never became wealthy bodies. It is a common notion that the English universities are very rich. In truth, the universities, as corporations, have, to this day, very little property. They hold a good deal in trust for various purposes in the universities. They draw an income from various payments made by their members, chiefly at taking degrees, and also from the profits of the university press. But of actual property of its own the university itself, the corporation of the chancellor, masters, and scholars, holds very little. Nor had the universities for many ages any great public buildings. At Oxford the university held its meetings in Saint Mary's Church and buildings attached to it. There is no important university building in Oxford older than the latter part of the fifteenth century.

The element of property and of the influence which follows property, and the element of buildings also, came in with the colleges. The word *college,* in its original meaning, has nothing to do with learning or education. It simply means a company of men of any kind, associated for some common purpose and usually holding common property. In the universities a college means a foundation for the maintenance of masters or scholars in the university, living together according to such rules as its founder lays down. They have a house to live in, and property, land, or tithe to live on. The first masters and scholars in the universities lived where they could and how they could ; they had no houses and no endowments. Gradually the scholars began to live together in small societies, in houses called halls, which at first might be the property of anybody. A hall might belong to a citizen who let his house for scholars to live in, or it might belong to a monastery which kept it for the use of its own members who went to study in the university. Gradually the halls were brought under some kind

of university discipline, as lodging-houses are now. Scholars lived in a hall, with a master as its principal. But at Oxford the halls never became corporate bodies holding property. Anything given for their benefit was held for them in trust by the university. At Cambridge the case is seemingly different, but only seemingly. That is to say, when endowed societies began to be founded, some of those at Cambridge were called *halls* and some *colleges*. The name does not matter. If by a hall be understood a house occupied by students, a college is simply an endowed and incorporated hall. Only at Oxford some of the older unendowed halls lived on alongside of the endowed colleges, while at Cambridge *hall* and *college* mean the same thing.

The system of colleges began in the reign of Henry the Third, in the year 1274, when Walter of Merton, Bishop of Rochester, removed to Oxford a body of scholars which he had already begun to found at Merton, in Surrey. His example was followed in 1280 by Hugh of Balsham, Bishop of Ely, who founded Saint Peter's College, commonly called Peterhouse, in Cambridge. This oldest college at Cambridge grew, like many others, out of the system of halls. The founder had already given two halls for the reception of scholars. He afterwards gave them the full form and endowment of a college. These two, Merton and Peterhouse, are the oldest foundations at Oxford and Cambridge respectively. Two others at Oxford, University and Balliol, claim an older date, but untruly. They arose out of benefactions older than that of Walter of Merton, but not benefactions which took the shape of a college. They did not take the form of colleges till long after. It is a puzzling thing to strangers that one of the colleges in the University of Oxford should be specially called University College. Are they not all university colleges? So in a sense they are. But University College had something specially to do with the university. Its proper name was the Great Hall of the University. That is, it grew out of a hall which was the property of the university itself. That it, or anything else at Oxford, unless possibly military works, was founded by Alfred, King of the West Saxons, in the ninth century, is pure fiction.

From the thirteenth century, then, till the nineteenth, colleges—endowed foundations for the residence and maintenance of students—have been at various times founded in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In several cases, as at Peterhouse,

as in the last foundation of a college, that of Hertford at Oxford only a few years back, the college grew out of an older hall. That is, the hall supplied the site and buildings for the new foundation. A college is not in itself a place of education. It is a house for men to dwell in who come to profit by the education and other advantages given by the university. Subject to any later changes made by the law of the land, each college holds such property as its founder gave it; it is governed by such statutes as its founder made for it; it is under such visitation as the founder decreed for it, the King, a bishop, the heir or representative of the founder, or any other. With the property of any college, with its internal management, the university has nothing to do; each college is subject to later benefactions and to changes made by the authority of the state, whatever its founder chose to make it. The founder made his endowment for such fellows or scholars as he thought good, under a head with whatever title he thought good. Some colleges have been enlarged by later benefactions; some have not. Their connection with the university consisted mainly in this: the founder required the members of his college to be students in the university, and to take such and such degrees, and the only way of getting those degrees was by going through such examinations or other exercises as the university required.

The constitutions of the colleges follow one general pattern, but most colleges have some peculiarities of their own. That some foundations are richer than others, that some consist of more members than others, is only the common course of human affairs. But there are all manner of differences between college and college. Some foundations had only one class of members, called indifferently fellows and scholars. In others the fellows are an older, the scholars a younger, class. In some the choice of the fellows and scholars was perfectly open; in others they had to be chosen from particular schools or counties. In some the scholars had a claim to the fellowships or a preference for them; in others not. In some the fellows were bound sooner or later to take holy orders; in others some or all might remain laymen. In some it was necessary or advantageous to take the higher degrees in divinity, law, or medicine; in others degrees in arts were enough. But all colleges agreed in one point. As the very essence of a college was that it should be a body of students living together

in common, the fellows and scholars were necessarily unmarried. This had nothing to do with the celibacy of the clergy; it was implied in the very nature of a college, and applied to lay and clerical fellows equally. Above all, no one must fancy that the colleges in the universities are, or ever were, as they are sometimes foolishly called, "monastic" bodies. Save in one or two cases, where a hall belonging to a monastery had grown into a college, there was nothing monastic about them. From the foundation of Merton onwards, any man who "entered religion," that is, who took the monastic vows, at once lost his place in the college.

A college, then, was, in its beginnings, simply an endowed house for the residence and maintenance of students in the university. Its members had no kind of formal advantage over other members of the university who did not belong to any college. But it was gradually found that the life of a college had many practical advantages. It offered many attractions even to those who were not members of the foundation. Most colleges, therefore, besides their own fellows and scholars, took in other members of the university, who lived in college at their own cost. Gradually the practice of living in colleges became all but universal; the only exception was that some still lived in the few halls which survived. At last in the seventeenth century, by the statutes of Archbishop Laud, every member of the University of Oxford was bound to be a member of some college or hall. This rule has been abolished in our own times, and it is now again possible to be a member of the university without belonging to any college. As for the halls, they seem to be dying out. All, save one or two, have been either merged into some college or have themselves grown into colleges. On the other hand, the new body called Keble College, having no foundation, is not a real college, but only a very large hall.

The constitution of the university, in its original state, had, of course, nothing to do with the colleges. Looking at the university as a corporation, its constitution is highly democratic. Every qualified citizen of the commonwealth—that is, every member who has taken a complete degree in any faculty, and who keeps his name on the books and makes the needful payments—has a vote in the general assembly of the university. This is called convocation at Oxford and senate at Cambridge. The head

of the university is the chancellor, freely elected by the senate or convocation. The chancellor and convocation have power to make statutes, to make decrees for particular cases, and to confer degrees. But the conferring of ordinary degrees belongs at Oxford to a smaller body, the congregation, now known as the ancient house, to distinguish it from a later body of the same name. But this old democratic constitution has been in many ways modified, and also in some respects restored, in quite modern times. In the original constitution of the university college distinctions naturally went for nothing. The head of a college was, in the university, simply whatever his degree made him, master of arts or doctor of one of the higher faculties. He had no rights or place whatever beyond any other doctor or master. But the position was an influential one in itself, and one which could not fail to grow in importance as the colleges grew, and gradually came to take in all the members of the university.

The chancellor was at first a resident member of the university, standing to the whole university much as the head of each college did to his own college. But as the university grew in importance, its headship grew in dignity, if not in importance. Great men who were not resident, noblemen or ministers of state, were chosen chancellors. The active duties of the office fell to a vice-chancellor, and the vice-chancellor came, not unnaturally, to be appointed from among the heads of colleges. At last, by Archbishop Laud's statutes, the general discipline of the university, and specially the proposal of statutes and other measures to convocation, was placed in a body consisting of the vice-chancellor, the heads of colleges and halls, and the proctors. These last are the chief ministers of discipline in the university. They are chosen yearly. Anciently they were chosen by the whole body of convocation. By one of Laud's statutes the choice was transferred to the colleges in turn according to a certain cycle. Strictly, the choice was not in the college as such, but in those members of convocation who belonged to the college. Still in all these ways the colleges encroached on the university and undermined its constitution. To go back to our federal analogy, the state of things came to be somewhat as if the chief power of the Union were vested in a meeting of the governors of the several States. At Cambridge the heads of colleges got in some things more power than at Oxford; in others less. At Oxford all elections by convocation re-

mained free. At Cambridge the heads of colleges came at all elections by the senate to nominate two candidates, and the senate could choose only one of those two. On the other hand, the power of proposing measures to the senate was in another body representing the several faculties.

In all this we have said nothing about professors, tutors, or teachers of any kind. In the old theory of the university, every man who had taken a complete degree in any faculty was supposed to be able and willing to act as a teacher in that faculty. The words *doctor*, *master*, *professor*, all meant the same thing—one who had taken a complete degree of some kind. To this day every doctor in divinity is called, in Latin, "sacræ theologiæ *professor*." This use of words has given rise to some confusion. One has seen it said over and over again that John Wickliffe was "professor of divinity" at Oxford, meaning that he was the holder of a special and endowed office, like a professor now. But in Wickliffe's day there were no special and endowed professors of particular subjects. Wickliffe was professor only as every doctor in divinity was professor. But in his day the doctor's degree itself was still reckoned a great honor. The notion of every doctor and master being a teacher has died out in several ways. It has died out before the growth of endowed professors in the university and of tutors and lecturers in the several colleges. And it has died out still more by the lowering of the standard of degrees in all the faculties.

Till quite lately the degrees in the superior faculties had become quite nominal; they proved nothing. Now degrees in law and medicine have again come to have a meaning; but the degree in divinity is still little more than a form. So in arts the standard for the bachelor's degree is very low, and that for the master's degree is no higher. There is, to be sure, an elaborate system of class lists, in which various shades of honor are bestowed on the candidates for the bachelor's degree. But it is the class which is valued; the degree itself is a small matter. The supposed necessity of marking by special honors those whose work is really creditable, the further development of having wholly distinct examinations for those who seek for honors and for those who do not, show how low the mere degree has fallen. And, besides this, the master's degree is given, as a matter of course, to every bachelor of the required standing, without further examina-

tion or other exercise. This, at least, is not as it should be. In any university the degree alone should be worth something; it should be worth a good deal. The lower degree should mark something, and the higher degree should mark more. The bachelor's degree should be respectable, and the master's degree should be honorable.

To explain the exact position of an Oxford professor and an Oxford tutor to one who is not familiar with the system is even harder than to explain the relations between the university and the colleges. The professor, as I have just said, is an endowed university teacher. In an university which has no colleges the professors will naturally be the immediate teachers of the undergraduates. In an university which has colleges that work will more naturally fall to the college tutors. In such a case the professor is, or ought to be, a master of his own subject, the representative of that subject in the university, ready to lecture and teach in every shape within the higher ranges of that subject. He is not called upon to give the ordinary teaching needed for the degree. Of course no teaching ought to have the degree as its immediate object; all such teaching is to be eschewed as *cram*.

But there is clearly room for two classes of teachers—those who give the ordinary teaching in subjects required for the degree, and those who teach either subjects which are not required for the degree or the higher branches of those that are. The latter is the work of the professor—the master of his own subject, whatever that subject is. The former is the work of somebody else, most obviously of the college tutor. The tutor, as well as the professor, is a development, a very natural development, of the ancient doctor or master, qualified to teach as doctor or master. He is in his origin an university officer no less than the professor, and in his origin he had not necessarily anything to do with teaching.

The word *tutor* means, as Scottish lawyers, at all events, know, not a teacher, but a guardian. Every undergraduate was put under the care of a master as his tutor; and, as the college grew up, the tutor was naturally a member, commonly a fellow, of his own college. Gradually the chief work of teaching came to the tutors in the colleges. Nor is there the slightest objection to this, if proper relations existed between tutors and professors. Each has his separate work, and the two could very well work in

harmony. Perhaps there has been no time when both did work in harmony; perhaps there has been no time when both have worked at all. But in a healthy state of things, the tutor would take the lower and the professor the higher branches of university teaching. The tutor would be the immediate teacher of the men of his own college, to whom he stands in a personal relation. The professor would be a representative of the special branch of learning in the university generally, standing in no personal relation to any one, having nothing to do with examinations, but standing ready to give the higher instruction to any that need it—pupils, tutors, examiners, or any other. The ideal has perhaps never been carried out; it is certainly not carried out now. But it does seem to be one which it would not be impossible to carry out. It certainly seems to be that which is naturally suggested by the coexistence of the university and its several colleges. It might even be thought that it was one of the advantages of the coexistence of the university and the colleges that such a division of the work of teaching is possible.

The causes which have hindered the carrying-out of such an ideal state of things are many and of many kinds. Some are old; some are new. Some it might be easy to get rid of; with some the work of improvement would be harder. But this sketch of the way in which the English university grew up in its main features may possibly be of some interest to those who are better used to other systems. It may even have interest enough to make some wish to hear a little more of the changes made during the present century, and of the practical working of things at the present moment.

EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

INDUSTRIAL AND FINANCIAL COÖPERATION.

BY FRANCIS B. THURBER.

THE increasing tendency of the larger business houses to incorporate is noticeable, and it is interesting to examine the whys and wherefores of it, and also take a glance at the entire coöperative field.

The underlying causes to which the increased activities of coöperation are chiefly attributable, are, undoubtedly, steam, electricity, and machinery, which constitute the controlling forces in the industrial, commercial, and, indeed, the entire politico-economic world. These forces have so increased the activities of competition, both in manufacturing and distribution, that they have greatly fostered the transaction of business on a large scale, which could command the best talent and the greatest economies.

This is manifested in so many different forms that it is difficult to do more than allude to some of the principal types of coöperative effort; and these, perhaps, naturally divide into coöperative production and coöperative distribution. It is in the latter that the greatest strides seem to have been made, although the coöperative principle is being recognized increasingly in both branches.

It is now many years since the manufacture of butter and cheese by the factory or coöperative system became a success, and through this the average quality of our butter and cheese supply has been greatly improved, with the result also that prices, on the whole, are considerably higher; a tendency, by the way, which is in striking contrast with the effect on most other articles that are produced coöperatively.

Various persons have claimed the credit of introducing the "factory" system of cheese-making, but while many have helped, probably no one person is entitled to the entire credit. It was perfectly evident that some farms possessed better facilities than others for making cheese. Some localities had better water;

some possessed more skilful cheese-makers; some had better appliances than others; and it was a natural evolution of the business that it should occur to some one that if the milk or cream was brought to a central station where the best facilities existed, and where it could be manipulated by an expert, a better result would be obtained than where a dozen or twenty different farmers operated under as many different conditions and with varying degrees of skill.

So the manufacture of cheese under the factory system became at once a success, and suggested the coöperative system in making butter, which is popularly known as the "creamery" system; all the farmers within a given area bringing their cream to a central station, where it is made into butter, with a much better average result than would be obtainable by individual effort.

The same principle is now worked out in the manufacture of sugar, the cane being conveyed to central sugar-houses, and in many different mining and manufacturing companies, where, to prosecute the business economically, more capital than is at the command of the average individual operator is required. Hence companies have been formed in which capital is worked coöperatively, producing far better results than could otherwise be obtained. Any number of stockholders can thus be combined as partners in an establishment large enough to command the best talent and the best facilities.

The stocks of the great manufacturing establishments, both in England and the United States, are, in many cases, widely distributed; and where this did not take place in the beginning, as the business increased and the vitality of the individual owners decreased, in many cases they were reorganized upon a coöperative basis.

The uncertainties of life, and the difficulty of valuing and distributing estates after death, especially where a business was conducted by a partnership, are, of themselves, a strong reason for organizing upon a stock-company basis, and of late years there have been many cases, both in productive and distributive coöperation, where this was a controlling consideration.

DISTRIBUTIVE COÖPERATION.

Probably the first prominent instances of distributive coöperation were found in transportation lines. Even before the advent

of steam, individual shipowners combined their interests in lines of packet-ships, whose regularity of sailing, combined with the best-known improvements in the handling of merchandise and the quality of service rendered, gave them an advantage over irregular ships, which in this day and generation are now generally known in trade parlance as "tramps"—a graphic bit of trade slang, by the way, which well illustrates the tendency of business to organize more closely.

With the advent of railroads on land, coöperation in their construction and operation became a necessity; and, as an agency in the distribution of products, banks also furnish a prominent illustration of the economies and effectiveness of coöperative effort.

Distributive coöperation has been, perhaps, brought before the public most prominently through the success of the so-called coöperative stores in England, but such stores, strange to say, in this country have not been a success, although other forms of coöperation here have succeeded admirably. The reason, however, is probably found in the different conditions. In England the retail trade had grown into a system of long credits. Many landed proprietors and others received their income only at long intervals, and this led retail merchants into the habit of selling a large portion of their trade on long time, which inevitably resulted in considerable losses from bad debts; so the dealers had to raise their margins of profit upon all their customers to a point which would still leave them a living. This was virtually making the cash-paying customer support the customer who did not pay at all; and when this abuse became extended, the persons with fixed incomes who paid their debts naturally objected, and the result was the formation of societies for coöperative distribution on an economical cash basis.

One of the first of these societies was started at Rochdale, a manufacturing centre, and its success stimulated the establishment of similar societies in other places, until finally a wholesale coöperative society was established at Manchester for the supply of constituent retail societies. The employees of the civil service, and the army and navy, representing considerable classes by themselves, established large supply stores, which deal in almost everything required in the household, and have been very successful. The success, however, of the first-comers in the distributive

coöperative field induced many others to make similar attempts, which were not equally successful. The grocers soon learned that in order to compete with the coöperative establishments they must adopt the cash system, and give as good or better value and service, and this has been done to a great extent. It is safe to say that the coöperative movement in England grew out of a necessity, and has remedied an abuse. The same state of things did not exist in the United States. Retail merchants generally sold on closer margins of profit; many of them did business for cash; and hence the same conditions and necessities did not exist here that gave rise to the coöperative stores in England. Many attempts have been made, but only a few of them have succeeded, and those only to a moderate extent. In such cases success was probably due to exceptionally good management, and perhaps, to some extent, to other local conditions favoring coöperative distribution. It is probable also that the opportunities in this country for enterprising men to develop had something to do with the difficulties experienced here in obtaining competent and honest managers for reasonable compensation. Men reasoned that, if they could make money for a coöperative association, they could make as much, or more, for themselves, and did not feel called upon to sacrifice their own interests to the coöperative idea.

A phase of the coöperative principle which has attracted much attention during the last few years has been the reorganization of firms into corporations, and the virtual admission of the public to partnership in the various establishments. This has become of great interest to investors, and has attracted a great deal of capital from savings-institutions and from other investments paying but a small rate of interest.

In some lines of business there seems to be almost an epidemic of such reorganizations, especially in England. Take, for instance, the brewing business in both England and the United States. Beginning with the Guinness breweries in Dublin a few years ago, there have been absorbed a large number of the most prominent breweries in England, Ireland, and this country; and more recently the idea has extended to other lines, prominent among which are the London concerns of Foster & Porter, and the Fore Street Warehousing Company, wholesale dry-goods establishments, and John Howell & Co., jewellers; and very recently it has been announced that Messrs. Maple & Co., the great furnishing-

house of London, has been turned into a corporation with a capital of £2,000,000, or $10,000,000.

In this country the establishment of Tiffany & Co., of New York, was probably the first prominent example of a commercial house becoming a corporation, and its greatest successes have been achieved since its change of form. Last year the great dry-goods house of H. B. Claflin & Co. became the H. B. Claflin Company, and within a few months Thurber, Whyland & Co., probably the oldest and largest wholesale grocery house in the world, became the Thurber, Whyland Company.

In all these cases the capital stocks were very widely distributed, a feature being large subscriptions by employees; and a feature of some of the later incorporations, notably that of the Trow Directory, Printing, and Bookbinding Company, is that the employees are represented in the board of directors by one of their number. This class of stocks is, as a rule, sought for by small investors who wish to make more than the rate of interest allowed by savings-banks and trust companies. They are non-speculative in character, and such investments are likely to become favorites with the smaller class of *bonâ-fide* investors.

Another class of coöperative investments, somewhat more speculative in character, is found in the combinations in various industries, such as the Standard Oil Company, or Trust, with a capital, or "certificates," of $90,000,000; the American Sugar-Refining Company, commonly known as the "Sugar Trust," which has combined the principal sugar refineries of the country, with a capitalization of $50,000,000; the National Cordage Company, which embraces the principal rope, cordage, and twine manufacturers of the country, with a capital of $15,000,000; the American Cotton-Oil Company, with a capital of $32,000,000, which undertakes to own and control the principal mills for making cotton-seed oil; the Distillers and Cattle-Feeders' Company, with a capital of $31,500,000, which owns nearly all the distilleries of the country manufacturing alcohol and spirits; the Lead Trust Company, which owns and controls the principal white-lead manufactories of the country, with a nominal capital of $90,000,000; the Linseed-Oil Trust, capital $18,000,000; the American Tobacco Company, capital $10,000,000, which has practically consolidated the cigarette and smoking-tobacco manufactories of the country; the National Starch Company,

capital $9,500,000; and there are a number of other organizations formed for the purpose of controlling some particular industry, limiting production to the wants of the market, and maintaining prices which will be remunerative to the manufacturers.

In these objects they have been only partially successful; and it may be said that only in cases where prices have been kept down to a reasonable profit, so that new capital is not tempted into these industries, are they likely to be successful. Their shares are dealt in on the Stock Exchange, and some of them are extremely speculative in character, exhibiting violent fluctuations as they are worked up and down by the "insiders." Unless this speculative element is eliminated, it will probably injure the reputation of industrial stocks generally as legitimate investments. Indeed, it has already been proposed to call the securities of the individual corporations "commercial investment stocks," in order to distinguish them from the more speculative "industrials," which usually represent amalgamations of different establishments.

Even the speculative industrials, however, are likely, in the long run, to pay investors dividends much larger than investments in railroad securities; and the only wonder is, when one contemplates the vast number of railroad reorganizations, with the wiping-out or scaling-down of investments through competitive building, and the cutting of rates by speculative directors and managers, to say nothing of Granger legislation and Inter-State Commerce-Law complications, that investors do not stop buying railroad securities altogether and invest in industrial or commercial investment stocks.

The following from the New York *Daily Commercial Bulletin* of January 7, 1891, strikingly illustrates how investors in railroad securities have been swindled:

"The Chicago *Railway Age* publishes a compilation showing the foreclosure sales and receiverships of railroads in the United States during 1890, which strikingly reflects the depressed condition of that interest. Within the past year twenty-nine companies were subjected to foreclosure sale, with a funded debt of $90,851,000 and a capital stock of $91,654,000. Discouraging as this showing may appear, yet it is a fact still more discouraging that the foreclosures of the last fifteen years show even a higher annual average than those of 1890. Since 1875 the aggregate foreclosure sales cover 50,525 miles, with $2,865,000,000 of combined stock and bonds, or an average of $191,000,000 per annum. Of this huge total, $980,000,000 occurred during the three years 1885, 1886, and 1887; and yet so little was the moral effect of

those disastrous years that, immediately following, a furore of speculative construction set in which resulted in the severe financial crisis from which we are now emerging. The foregoing significant figures, however, tell only part of the story; for, within the past year 2,963 miles of road have been placed under receiverships with a combined total of capital stock and bonds amounting to $105,007,000. When may we expect investors to learn better than to put their capital into railroad schemes started on a wholly speculative basis?"

Industrial investments may have their good and their bad years, but they certainly cannot fail to make a better record by far than the foregoing, or, indeed, the government loans in which English and other foreign investors have so freely invested their savings at low rates of interest.

BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS.

Another form of coöperative investment which has grown very rapidly during the past few years is the building and loan associations, which are nothing more or less than coöperative savings-banks, and constitute a form of life insurance which has been as successful as it has been beneficent. But few people are aware of the extent to which the coöperative principle has been applied in this direction. A recent article in *Bradstreet's* says:

"The aggregate resources of the savings associations of the country are nearly 60 per cent. of the entire assets of all State, savings, loan and trust companies and private banks and bankers from which reports were received last year. Their deposits were less than 10 per cent. below those of the national banks, and were more than twice as large as the total capital stock of the national banks. With this true now, when ordinary savings-banks are practically confined to a small part of the country, what will happen when the new form of savings-bank gets its growth throughout the Union?"

The chief development of the building and loan associations has been in the Western States, although they have also a strong hold in the Middle States. The last report of the Comptroller of the Currency showed that, of the 637 strictly old-style mutual savings-banks in the country, all but 11 are in the New England and Middle States with Maryland and the District of Columbia.

The building and loan association, or coöperative savings-bank, has many features which give it superiority over the ordinary savings-bank. It is conducted by people who give it their time for nothing, as the association meets generally but once a month in some room or hall where the expense is but small for rent and fittings. Deposits are paid at stated periods and the depositors themselves really control and manage the association.

The only drawback has been that these really beneficent coöperative institutions have been somewhat interfered with by speculative organizations similar in name and calling themselves national building and loan associations and various other high-sounding titles. These are gotten up by schemers who seek to ride into the possession or control of capital on the front wave of popularity of the local building and loan associations. Various States are now enacting legislation which will bring all forms of coöperative savings-banks or associations under State supervision, and it is expected that this will tend to prevent or restrict the abuses of the so-called national building and loan associations before alluded to.

Other features of the building and loan association, or the coöperative savings-bank, are, that it lends only to depositors, that it lends to the highest bidder (provided the security is good), and secures by the share system repayment on the instalment plan. It has become a popular means for workingmen to procure homes; and this, together with the industrial establishments taking the form of corporations in which employees and the public can become shareholders and virtually partners, is destined in the near future to play an important part in advancing the prosperity of the masses. It is a development of the coöperative idea which is in perfect accord with the spirit of our country's institutions; and although we may never reach Mr. Bellamy's politico-economic millennium, coöperation in its various phases will do much to that end.

F. B. THURBER.

THE RELATIONS OF LITERATURE TO SOCIETY.

BY MRS. AMELIA E. BARR.

Most social truths are truths for circumstances, and for periods; they are very seldom truths absolute and eternal. Among such passing verities, Carlyle's dictum concerning what book-writers do for the world and the small esteem the world has for book-writers must be classed. That literature has not yet found its harmonious relation to society is true; but it is not true that any large or important portion of society acts toward literature as depicted in a late society novel—that is, it does not hide the fact of a woman writing a book, as if she had committed some unpardonable social crime. A minority, at whose pretensions the world takes leave to laugh with a good-natured tolerance, may indeed regard writers with scorn, but the writers feel for this minority a contempt so measureless as to leave a good standing balance in their own favor.

So far, then, the two classes are quits; yet it may not be amiss to give a moment's consideration to the assertion of this Brahminical Four Hundred that writing is "low," and that it is especially "low" for a woman. These definitions are understood when explained by the rules governing a set so exclusive. Writers have ideals; writers are original in speech, in dress, and manners. Now, among a class where the commonplace and the conservative are invincible rules of conduct, where etiquette has a bible of its own, and the laws of dining, dressing, speech, company, and even feeling, are decorously and definitely laid down, could there be anything more impertinent that an ideal, more vulgar than originality? And as a woman sinning against the social code is a sinner above all others, it is perhaps a justifiable kindness to prevent her from making a book. Such a declaration of individuality might open the door for her rebellion against social slavery of all kinds.

But the number of this social set is very small, and their influence upon the great world of thought and action almost *nil*. Nothing is lost to literature by their neglect, and nothing would

be gained by their condescending to use literature as an expounder of their articles of faith and admiration. Writers of all sorts may easily let this portion of society be to them as if they were not.

However, it might, with some show of truth, be asserted that literature has not a high social standing, even among that large class of sensible citizens whose mental capacities have been well developed, and whose refinement is as evident as their wealth—men and women who live noble lives, in constant contact with the great facts of life, just and generous, free from arrogance, ardently appreciative of every good book. And, as in all good books there is an invisible element, a subtile principle emanating from the writer to the reader, it does seem singular that the book which is part of the writer—his soul impressed on the white paper—should be highly valued, and he himself awaken no living interest; nay, perhaps meet only with indifference or dislike.

We may find a partial answer to this singular condition by applying to literature that commercial test so well understood in all other matters. Men and women write books either because they have something to say or because they are under the necessity of saying something. In the first case, literature is followed for literature's sake, and society feels that it is under an obligation for the effort to please or instruct it. In the second case, the book has been written as a means of livelihood; the writer has the financial result, and society is under no more obligation to him or to her than it is to the clergyman who preaches to it for money, or the lawyer who defends it for money, or the physician who heals it for money. A fine rider, a clever ball-player, a tireless walker, are all objects of social admiration and respect, until they turn these accomplishments into a means of livelihood; then the athlete, the pitcher, the rider, the dancer, find that in accepting a financial reward they have forfeited their social recognition; perhaps not unfairly so, for few things are worth paying twice for, and they who desire the cash must do without the praise and admiration.

This position is easily comprehensible under old monarchical dispensations, but certainly anomalous in a country where money is the test of all efforts, and the making of money the most honorable of occupations. Indeed, we must go back to the very beginnings of social life to discover its origin, and acknowledge that for sixty centuries the world has held the men of action

higher than the men of thought. The soldier Cæsar received from it the imperial crown; the thinker Christ, the shameful cross. Romulus the fighter is remembered; Remus the seer is forgotten. At the end of the nineteenth century we are still barbarians enough to think a successful soldier higher than an almost godlike inventor. For this world is a material world, and it ranks men as they meet its necessities. The fighter and the money-maker touch constantly its most active and imperious demands; the writer and the thinker only serve its higher and most transitory moods. If, then, writers and thinkers are not satisfied with the amount of social consideration they receive, they have only to desist from instructing and entertaining mankind, and do something for a livelihood which touches what men eat or drink, or the wherewith of their dress or adornment.

These are radical and ancient causes of slight esteem, but there are others which are generic, and which spring from the profession. First, there is a singular lack of *esprit de corps* in the higher walks of it · even successful writers have not scrupled to make its peculiarities and poverty "material" for their wit; as in "Pendennis," where Thackeray introduces his readers to writers, publishers, editors, and contributors who are neither attractive nor respectable, and who are rather abnormal than typical.

But it is the easy entrance into the ranks of literature which is the great cause of whatever social contempt clings to the profession. A man who goes into a large trading business, or who spends years in preparing for the law, gives society a bond for his respectability. He has invested either time or money, perhaps both. But a pretence of literature is too often used by the lazy and vicious as a cloak for their evil lives, and thus the noblest of professions becomes a kind of cave of Adullam, to which men of unsteady habits and women of doubtful respectability resort. A sprightly fancy, a ready wit, a knowledge of life, a soured disposition able and unscrupulous enough to write scurrilous personalities, are all the introduction needed to the daily press, where the demand is constant, and the availability depends more on the mental than the moral qualities of its servants. For if a man writes a brilliant paper, do the public really care whether he is a member of a Christian association or not?

But this class of writers are in no true sense "men of letters." They produce paragraphs, epigrams, short, clever sketches, short

stories, poems for the newspapers and other periodicals; but works demanding learning, patience, steady application, are as much beyond their power as they are out of their liking. Such ephemeral literary workers can no more be classed with writers like Mr. Grote, Mr. Holmes, or Mr. Stevenson than the petti-fogger can be counted the peer of the judge in the Supreme Court, or the pedler of quack nostrums the equal of the leading physician of the age. For a really great writer never falls into a class; he has a marked individuality, and stands alone. But the world has no time to make such distinctions; hence the justice of the financial test: a great writer can now obtain great financial results, and society accepts this credential of his power and respectability.

It must finally be regretfully admitted that women writers have done much to degrade the profession of literature. They do hasty and slip-shod work, inaccurate and sentimental, overloaded with adjectives, frescoed all over with purple patches of what they consider fine writing. But this is a venial fault; where they chiefly offend is in making love the all-important and absorbing passion of life. Their stories teach too often that a girl has an absolute right to the fool of her choice, though she has to break every holy domestic tie to gratify herself. Further, Florence Layard accuses them of being the translators of the lowest and most sensual French novels, though they gain by this dirty work only the smallest and most precarious of incomes. Is the world much to blame if it gives some of the odium due to a profession which offers women such opportunities?

But then it is not only literature which is wounded in the house of its reputed friends; all other professions are obliged to suffer in the same way: theology, law, and the faculty of medicine are alike degraded by unworthy members of their fraternities. At this day it is very certain that good writers receive all the attention from the social world they can desire; and if they do not enter society, it is because they do not wish to do so. The day has gone by for either patronage or lionizing. American authors never admitted the superiority of gold; and even in England a Lady Holland would not now find any Tom Moore to snub in public. Good society is emulous of giving honor to whoever has written a good book; and it is not true that either men or women need to suffer socially for having done so.

In fact, the tendency of the very highest society is now to

affect literature. Queens and princes, lords and ladies, are eager not only for the fame, but for the financial results, of literature. For literature no longer starves its professors ; on the contrary, hundreds whom law, theology, and medicine suffer to starve come to literature and are fed.

"All the clever people in society could write books, if they would condescend to do it ;—I could," said a silly little girl, who danced around the first tier of millionaires. It is a pity her opinion is not correct. We might then have some literary dandyism ; beautiful volumes composed between the short and long sentences of fashionable hard labor—prose full of musk and millefleurs, with all the lace and jewelry of style and versification. But this is not likely, because, however clever people may be, it requires something more than "condescension" to write books. It is not enough to think, and to know ; there must be the faculty of utterance, and of a peculiar kind of utterance. Writing comes by art, not by chance. The efforts of chance writers, even if they be clever, are things for editors to lose their sweetest tempers over. Perhaps there may be nothing in writing good books, and people who do not write them may be as intellectual as those who do. Whoever think so, let them try it. As surely as they do, they will find that an amateur book will as certainly betray itself as an amateur attempt to make a dress-coat.

The true writer gives his whole intellect and his whole time to his work, and he is satisfied to do so. He has no time and no interest to spare for tiddledy-winks and donkey parties, nor even for progressive euchre. It does not amuse him to say "so nice," and "so pleasant," and "thanks," fifty times an hour, and to say very little else more sensible. He objects to being made a lion of, to writing his autograph for gushing girls, to playing games he abandoned with his short jacket and school-books. So, then, it is not society which is unappreciative of literature ; in ten cases out of ten it is literature which cannot fold itself small enough for society. For in spite of all controversy, it is a great thing to influence public opinion, to inform the ignorant, to solace the unhappy, and to give to unknown multitudes a high, and pure enjoyment.

"For many can talk, and more can fight,
But few give myriads of hearts delight."

AMELIA E. BARR.

THE ART OF MAGIC.

BY CHEVALIER HERRMANN.

I HAVE been requested to lay before the readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW such of my reflections upon the art of magic or prestidigitation as I may deem worthy of note, drawn from a continuous experience of thirty years in practising that art. My travels in connection therewith have led me into nearly every part of the habitable world.

Prestidigitation is sleight-of-hand manipulation, pure and simple, whether evolved from mechanical, chemical, or scientific devices, or produced by dexterity that baffles vision because motion is quicker than sight. The magician depends for the success of his art upon the credulity of the people. Whatever mystifies, excites curiosity; whatever in turn baffles this curiosity, works the marvellous.

Of course human ignorance is no longer a source of profit to the magician, as it was in the days of the diviner, the oracle, and the soothsayer. Few believe nowadays that the magician claims any supernatural aid. I will scarcely be believed, therefore, when I tell my readers that in a few cities in Italy and Spain in which I have performed hundreds came to see me as a curiosity, impressed with the belief that for the power he gave me I had made a compact with the devil for the delivery of my soul. In these cities I have seen people reverently cross themselves when I was passing.

To what folly ignorance could once go on this point is best illustrated by quoting the King James statute against witchcraft. It was a supplement to the milder enactments against the same felony instituted during the reign of Elizabeth :—

"If any person shall use, practise, or exercise any invocation or conjuration of any evil and wicked spirit, or shall consult, covenant with, entertain, employ, feed, or reward any evil and wicked spirit to or for any intent and purpose, or take up any dead man, woman, or child out of their grave,

or the skin, bone, or any part of any dead person, to be used in any manner of witchcraft, sorcery, or enchantment, whereby any person shall be killed, destroyed, wasted, consumed, pined, or harmed in his or her body, or any part thereof, that then every such offender, their aiders, abetters, and counsellors shall suffer the pains of death."

Upon this statute many innocent persons were condemned and executed with scarcely the formality of a trial, so great was the reaction engendered against what the very ignorance of the times had begotten and cultivated. This bloodthirsty statute was the basis of the persecution of so-called witches in New England, and its absurdity was acknowledged in the year 1736 by its abolition in England by a law enacting that no capital prosecution should for the future take place for conjuration, sorcery, and enchantment, and to protect the gullible from being swindled by card-readers professing to foretell the occurrence of future events, by providing for their punishment as common nuisances.

Asia even more than Egypt is the land of secrecy. In all other lands wisdom seeks diffusion; there it is valued for its rarity. Its very language is enigmas, figures, and ambiguity, producing perplexity rather than instruction. Time was when the student of prestidigitation aspiring to fame in his art did not consider his education complete without a visit to India. But this is no longer necessary. The very secretiveness of the East Indian juggler, and his lack of communication with others of his art elsewhere, have lost him the prestige he once commanded. Whatever was wrested from him by close observation has been wonderfully improved upon. He has gone on in the performance of the same old tricks by the same old devices, transmitted from father to son and from generation to generation. The elder magicians soon learned that the first business of the East Indian juggler was to act upon the passions by the excitement of awe and fear in the spectators. Impressionable natives were easily subject to these passions, and while filled with them by the handling of snakes or cimeters by the juggler, it was easy to distract attention and, by manipulation too rapid to be followed by the unpractised eye, to produce phenomena unanticipated and that could not be accounted for. A European magician could not count on the excitement of the same passions on the part of his audience as a preliminary step in the performance of his tricks; and yet he has duplicated every trick of the Oriental and improved upon it.

I discovered this state of things on my first visit to India. I longed to visit this home of magicians. I was disappointed—disagreeably so. Many of the wonders of Hindoo jugglery that I had read about were but the grossly exaggerated tales of travellers. That famous trick, related by nearly every writer on Hindoo jugglery, of youths tossing balls of twine in the air and climbing up on them out of sight, I did not see, nor could I find during my visit any well-authenticated evidence that it was ever done. The tricks I saw I could have imitated with little preparation. I would not presume to introduce them upon the stage.

On my first evening at Bombay a troupe of these jugglers appeared upon the plaza in front of the hotel at which I was staying. They were fantastically dressed and painted, and drew a crowd by beating the tom-tom. After a short address by the leader, one of them produced an empty flower-pot, which he filled with earth and moistened with water, dropping a few mango seeds into the pot during the process. He covered the flower-pot with a large piece of cloth and rested it on a tripod of bamboo sticks. He addressed a few remarks to the spectators, and then walked slowly around the covered pot, dexterously allowing his robes to envelop it at each turn, while his followers sang a howling song of incantation. After three minutes of these proceedings he silenced his choristers, removed the cloth from the pot, and there was disclosed in it a mango-tree about three feet in height, which had apparently grown since planting the seed. He performed the trick by removing the pot beneath the cloth, and substituting the mango, which was concealed in his robe, and this he did rather clumsily while he let the robe rest for a moment, as if by accident, over the covered flower-pot previously displayed.

The basket trick was then performed, even more clumsily than the other. This trick consists in placing a boy in a covered basket and piercing it with swords which are exhibited all bloody, apparently having stabbed the boy to death, while the boy, unharmed, appears, coming from another part of the enclosure. This trick would scarcely be worth repeating anywhere to-day; yet the Hindoo juggler is content to exhibit it. The most clever trick I saw in India was done by a native with a cobra. The native wore no clothing save a clout. The cobra he deposited on the sand and covered with a cloth. He then began a series of incanta-

tions, which invariably accompany the performance of every trick, around the covered reptile, using his hands and arms in endless gesticulation. At last he snatched away the cloth. The snake had vanished, seemingly "into thin air," but in reality into the clout about the native's loins. During the gesticulations he had barely touched the cloth,—the signal for the cobra, which was trained,—and, bending for a moment so that the clout would fall into a fold, the snake leaped into it so quickly that the movement was unobserved. So little was I impressed with East Indian jugglery that I did not deem it a paying investment to incur the expense or labor of securing the most clever of the juggler's assistants.

The magicians of Europe, beginning with Houdin and Cagliostro, have given a great impetus to their art. I regard the magicians of to-day as the best the world has ever produced. The perfection of mechanical contrivances and the possibilities of electricity and chemistry have been wonderful helps in the exercise of the so-called black art. It is well for the magician that such is the case, for the demands upon him for novelty were never greater. I find the spectators at this species of entertainment more numerous and more interested than those of thirty years ago. How to entertain them leads up to the other question, What are the requisites and qualifications of the magician?

I could answer the question by a negative definition of what the magician should not be better than to state positively what his art should make him. No one regards the magician to-day as other than an ordinary man gifted with no extraordinary powers. The spectators come, not to be impressed with awe, but fully aware that his causes and effects are natural. They come rather as a guessing committee, to spy out the methods with which he mystifies. Hundreds of eyes are upon him. Men with more knowledge of the sciences than he come to trip and expose him, and to baffle their scrutiny is the study of his life. Long years of training and exercise alone will not make a magician. I could name a hundred men with these qualifications, who started out in the practice of legerdemain within the past thirty years, not one of whom is known now. There must be some natural aptitude for the art; it must be born in a man, and can never be acquired by rule. He must be alert both in body and in mind; cool and calculating to the movement of a muscle under all cir-

cumstances; a close student of men and human nature. To these qualifications he must add the rather incongruous quality of a mind turning on contradictions. With a scientific cause he must produce a seemingly opposite effect to that warranted by order and system.

I know of no life requiring such a series of opposite qualities as the magician's. And after the exercise of all these qualities I have named, resulting in the production of the most startling and novel results, the magician has not the satisfaction, like other men, of the enjoyment of his own product. He must be prepared to see it copied by others, or after a short time discovered by the public. Hence the magician must be an inventor, mechanical and scientific. Think of the time, thought, and weary labor given to the production of such tricks as the "cabinet mystery" of the Davenports, the "sealed tent" of the Eddys, the reading of letters in gummed envelopes, and the "second sight" of Houdin. All these are perplexing in their ingenuity, even after the methods of their performance are known.

Again, so great are the demands of the public upon the magician that he can no longer use the machinery and mechanical contrivances of his own invention with which he cumbered the stage formerly. For the most part he must perform his wonders with his contrivances so reduced as to be invisible. Formerly he could extract his birds from bags and covered cages, his flowers and fruits from friendly and unsuspicious-looking tables, and his live animals from confederates. Now he must produce all these things from the coats and pockets of the spectators.

I have not drawn a very rosy picture of the magician. I did not intend to do so. To the novice entering the life and promising himself ease, indolence, and wealth, I should say, "Don't!"

I have often been asked if the pursuit I follow does not become monotonous. By no means. There is an ever-recurring novelty in the life. Even if the tricks performed admitted of only one method instead of a dozen in their performance, there are the same puzzled lookers-on, wondering, tricked, and baffled through the most simple and natural causes. The magician controls them as potently as the orator controls his audience, and the enjoyment of his power is even greater. Monotonous? Never! The life of the magician is one of almost infinite variety.

If I were asked to designate any one particular illusion as the most brilliant I know, I should unhesitatingly mention that of the vanishing lady, invented by Buatier de Kolta. Its very success was its ruin, so transcendent was it in mystification. The effect of the trick upon the spectator, the first time he sees it, is nothing short of marvellous. The performer brings forward a lady to the front of the stage, seats her upon a chair in full view of the spectators, spreads over her a piece of filmy silk, so gauzy that the outlines of her figure may be discerned through it, and while she is in this position he whisks off the silk. The chair is there; the lady has vanished.

The explanatory details of this wonderful trick, which are now known by every tyro in the profession, would weary rather than instruct. I have often experimented with the trick myself as a curiosity. Suffice it to say that the elaborate mechanical operations necessary for its production would almost build a locomotive, and yet they are exhausted in a hundred springs and bolts of steel working like the springs of a watch and all coöperating, with the aid of a confederate working through a trap-door under the stage.

People have repeatedly asked me which of my tricks have pleased me the most, and which I take the most delight in performing. Naturally the effort that brings the greatest success is regarded by a man his best. I consider the trick of restoring the shattered mirror as my most famous one. This I had the honor of performing before the Czar of Russia upon an invitation to give an exhibition at his court. It was done unexpectedly to the spectators, and was not down on the regular bill. While playing billiards with the attachés of the court after the performance, the Czar being present in the saloon, I shot a ball with all my strength against a plate-glass mirror extending from floor to ceiling. It was shivered into fifty pieces. Consternation was depicted on every countenance; on none more plainly than my own.

While the Czar courteously waived my apology, considering the destruction of the mirror as trifling, and ordered the game to proceed, I could easily see that my supposed awkwardness made a disagreeable impression. With the Czar's permission I examined the mirror to estimate the damage done and the possibility of repairing it. While so engaged one of the suite playfully challenged

me to exercise my art and make the mirror whole again, never dreaming that his challenge was the very cue I wanted, and not considering the successful acceptance of it as possible. I hesitated an instant, and then ordered the mirror to be covered with a cloth entirely concealing it from view. On the removal of the cloth, after ten minutes, the mirror was found without a flaw, and as perfect as before the damage.

I will leave it to my readers' imagination to decide how this trick was done.

A. HERRMANN.

THE THEOLOGICAL CRISIS.

BY THE REV. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D. D., PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE church of Jesus Christ was established on the day of Pentecost by the advent of the divine Spirit in theophany. The divine Spirit came in fulfilment of the promise of the Messiah himself. "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. . . . Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth."—(John xvi., 7, 13.) The divine Spirit came in order to remain in the church as the counsellor and guide during the entire Messianic age until the second advent of the Son of God. Accordingly when the Christian Church in all lands and in all ages has expressed its faith "in the Holy Spirit," it has thereby confessed his presence and divine guidance in the church. All that wonderful advance in Christian life and doctrine that transformed the ancient civilizations, conquered Celtic, Germanic, and Slavonic races, and made Christianity the religion of the world, is an evidence of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.

Progress in doctrine and life is a necessary experience of a living church; and that progress will never cease until the church attains its goal in the knowledge of all the truth, in a holiness reflecting the purity and excellence of Jesus Christ, and in a transformed and glorified world.

Those holy men who were guided by the divine Spirit to found the Christian Church and build the first layers of its superstructure, have given sacred writings which must ever remain the rule of faith and life. Holy Scripture presents the ideal towards which the church ever aims with earnest strivings. The Holy Spirit guides the church in its appropriation of Holy Scripture, and this is ever a progressive knowing and a progressive practice, for Christian knowledge cannot advance far beyond Christian life.

I.—THE ADVANCE OF THE CHURCH.

Progress has always been confronted by conservatives and re-

actionaries. Jesus and Paul had a life-long struggle with Pharisees. Every advance in Christian doctrine and the holy life has cost the heroic leaders agony and blood. But the advance has been made in spite of every opposition. The conservative and the progressive forces are in perpetual conflict. They wage a war that will reach its end only in the last triumph of Christ.

The progress of the church is registered in symbolical books, liturgies, creeds, and canons of order and discipline. If the church had submitted itself to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, it is possible that its progress would have been normal and its decisions would have been infallible. But in fact human forces have obstructed the free development of Christian doctrine and life. Human passion and strife, violence, oppression, and crime have too often given shape and color to the decisions of Christian synods and councils; and therefore their decisions have mingled God's truth with human errors. We cannot rest with confidence upon the decrees of any ecclesiastical assembly.

"All synods and councils since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred. Therefore, they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice; but to be used as a help in both."—(West. Conf., XXXI., 4.)

The ancient controversies that separated the Oriental churches and then the Greek Church from the Latin Church were intensified by human passion and ambition. In all these controversies the doctrinal statements of the Latin Church were real advances in theology; but the unchristian conduct of the leaders of the church brought on those unfortunate divisions which not only sacrificed the unity of the church, but also gave Islam an easy victory over a distracted Christendom, and well-nigh yielded the supremacy of the world.

The Latin Church was in throes of reformation for many generations before Luther and Zwingli. The stubborn resistance to the reforming spirit broke the Latin Church into pieces, and resulted in the formation of a number of national churches over against the Church of Rome. These all defined their position in symbols of faith in antagonism with all other parties. The three great principles of the Protestant Reformation were: 1, the authority of the Scriptures is supreme over the authority of the church; 2. men are justified by faith in Jesus Christ, and not by good works prescribed by the church; 3, men are saved by divine grace,

and not by magical rites and ceremonies. These great principles of the Reformation gave new shape and color to all other Christian doctrines that were looked at from the new point of view.

The Reformers were men of great intellectual and moral vigor. Their doctrines were the expression of their Christian life and experience. But they were succeeded by lesser men who gave their energies to the construction of systems of dogma. These soon enveloped the principles of the Reformation in a cloud of speculations and established a Protestant scholasticism, ecclesiasticism, and ritualism which seemed to earnest men little better than that which the Reformers had cast aside. Accordingly a second reformation arose in Great Britain in the form of Puritanism, which reaffirmed and sharpened the principles of the Reformation and advanced towards a holy doctrine, a holy discipline, and a holy life. The Puritan Reformation passed over to the Continent in the form of Pietism and transformed the churches of Germany and Holland; but in Great Britain the Puritan became puritanical, and the choicest youth, driven from the British universities and educated in Switzerland and Holland, returned with a scholastic theology which soon took the place of the principles of Puritanism.

A third reforming movement arose with Whitefield, Wesley, Edwards, and others, and the doctrine of regeneration and Christian experience became the prominent features of the new advance. But this regenerating force ere long became hardened into a cold and barren evangelicalism.

All of these movements were due to the reviving influences of the divine Spirit, and each of them made marked advance in Christian theology and Christian life. Each advance, however, carried with it only a section of the church, so that the Christian Church of our day, in its divisions, represents every stage of progress since the apostolic times. This should lead to the reflection that these advances, however important in themselves, have not been sufficiently comprehensive and essential to embrace the whole of Christendom. The great verities of the Christian religion are in the Nicene and the Apostles' creeds, wherein there is concord. We stand upon the heights of the last of these great movements of Christendom. We accept all that has been gained in them all. But we recognize that each one of them in turn became exhausted and hardened and stereotyped in a dead orthodoxy, owing to

the reacting influences of conservatism and traditionalism. What is the gain if you substitute, first, Protestant tradition for Roman Catholic, and then Puritan for Protestant, and finally Evangelical for Puritan? The advance is in the principles and in the essential features of the movements. We must distinguish between the essential and the non-essential. As soon as we do this, we see Christendom rising in a pyramid of grace, encompassed by tombs of dead theories and parties, and dreary wastes of human speculation; and we discern that there is but one platform for Christendom—the common consent in the Nicene and the Apostles' creeds. All else is in the sphere of Christian liberty. As Isaac Taylor once said:

"But thus it is, and ever has been, that those who are sent by heaven to bring about great and necessary movements, which, however, are, after a time, either to subside, or to fall into a larger orbit, are left to the short-sightedness of their own minds in fastening upon their work some appendage (perhaps unobserved) which, after a cycle of revolutions, must secure the accomplishment of heaven's own purpose—the stopping of that movement. Religious singularities are heaven's brand, imprinted by the unknowing hand of man, upon whatever is destined to last its season, and to disappear."—("Wesley and Methodism," p. 81.)

We have reached a period in which all the great movements have spent their force, and there are that confusion, agitation, and perplexity which indicate the birth of a new movement that will absorb, comprehend, and carry to loftier heights all that have preceded it. When all the *isms* have been broken off, the jagged edges of controversies will disappear, and Christian parties will fuse into a common brotherhood.

II.—THE REAL ISSUE.

No one can understand the issues involved in the present theological crisis unless he distinguish three things: 1, the doctrine of Holy Scripture; 2, the doctrine of the creeds; 3, traditional dogma. In the evolution of Christian theology the constant tendency is to overlay Scripture and creed with tradition. Every reforming movement must strip off the traditional dogmas from the Scriptures and present the genuine achievement of the church as expressed in its official symbols apart from speculative elaborations. This is the real issue at the present time. There is a rally of dogmaticians and traditionalists against those Biblical and historical scholars who are aiming to dethrone tradi-

tion and put Holy Scripture and the creeds in their proper position of authority in the church.

It must be evident to every thinking man that the traditional dogma has been battling against philosophy and science, history and literature, and every form of human learning. In this battle the Bible and the creeds have been used in the interests of this dogma, and they and the church have been compromised thereby. It is of vast importance, therefore, to rescue the Bible and the creeds from the dogmaticians. There can be little doubt that the traditional dogma is doomed. Shall it be allowed to drag down into perdition with it the Bible and the creeds? The dogmaticians claim that their dogma is in the creed; if we do not submit to it, we must leave the church. They insist that their dogma is in the Bible, and if we do not accept it, we must give up the Bible. Biblical scholars and historical students propose to do neither of these things; on the contrary, to hold up the Bible as the supreme authority for the church; to build on the creeds as the ecclesiastical test of orthodoxy. Traditional dogma is a usurper, and it will be dethroned from its last stronghold in the Presbyterian Church.

Traditional dogma in the Presbyterian Church is chiefly the scholastic Calvinism of the seventeenth century of Switzerland and Holland, mingled with elements from British Evangelicalism of the eighteenth century. But alongside of it is an apologetic based upon the Arminianism of Bishop Butler and an ethical philosophy of the nineteenth century. It is this internal strife between Calvinistic dogma, Arminian apologetics, and rationalistic ethics that has brought on the crisis in the Congregational and Presbyterian churches. Calvinistic dogma has been well-nigh eliminated from the Congregational churches. In the Presbyterian Church semi-Arminianism demands a revision of the Calvinistic sections of the Westminster Confession. The Calvinistic party in the Episcopal Church is a vanishing quantity. The Baptist churches seem to be strong in their Calvinism, but there are signs of weakness in these also.

But the battle between Calvinism and Arminianism is no longer of any practical importance to the Christian world. The vast majority of Christians have settled down into an intermediate position. It may be important to Presbyterians to change the complexion of the Calvinism of the Westminster Confession, but

such a change will have little or no influence upon the currents of modern theology.

The most important questions of our day are not determined in any of the creeds of the church, and are, therefore, beyond the range of orthodoxy. When the church, in its official organs, decides these questions, then for the first time will they enter into the field of orthodoxy. Theological discussion at the present time is, for the most part, above and beyond the lines of denominational distinctions. All Christian theologians are engaged in them, without regard to sect or calling. They centre about three great topics: the first things—Bible, church, and reason; the last things—the whole field of eschatology; and the central thing—the person and work of Jesus Christ.

III.—THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY IN RELIGION.

This was an essential question at the Reformation. It has been a fundamental doctrine ever since. There are three seats of divine authority—the Bible, the church, and the reason. Define Bible, church, and reason as you may, in any case God approaches men through each of them. The Christian Church is divided into three great parties—Evangelicals, Churchmen, and Rationalists. But there are many subdivisions of these parties, and not a few who take intermediate positions. The Churchmen make the church supreme over Bible and reason. The Evangelicals make the Bible supreme over church and reason. The Rationalists make the reason supreme. The conflict between Roman Catholics and Protestants since the Reformation leaves these two great parties in very much the same relative strength as at the close of the sixteenth century. Two hundred years have shown that the one is not to conquer the other. But in the meanwhile the rationalistic party, which had but few adherents in the sixteenth century, has gained from Roman Catholic and Protestant alike. On the continent of Europe, at least, it is well-nigh equal to either of the others. It seems altogether probable that neither party is to yield in the contest; there must be some way of reconciliation in a higher unity. All earnest men should strive after such a reconciliation. The historian recognizes that men have found God in the Bible, the church, and the reason. If this is so, it is evident that those who use the three media of communication with God,

and use them to the utmost, will be most likely to attain the highest degree of union and communion with God. It is the opinion of Christian scholars that Socrates and pure-minded heathen have ever found God in the forms of the reason. Why should we deny that a modern Rationalist like Martineau, and seekers after God among the people who are fenced off from Bible and church by the exactions of priest and ecclesiastic, find God enthroned in their own hearts? The divine Spirit "worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth" (West. Conf., x., 3); and though he ordinarily works through Bible and church, yet when these channels of divine grace are obstructed by the rags of human dogmatism, or when by the neglect of the ministry they do not reach forth to the weak, the ignorant, and the destitute, the divine Spirit works without them in the enlightening and salvation of men. When I take this position, I do not deny the Protestant position that Holy Scripture is supreme. I simply affirm that, where Holy Scripture does not work as a means of grace, the divine Spirit may work now as he worked before the Bible and the church came into existence.

When I say that Newman and multitudes of Roman Catholics, Greek Catholics, Orientals, and churchmen of every name have found God through the church, I agree with the Reformers in recognizing these as Christians, and I do not deny the supremacy of the Scriptures. Where the Scriptures are withheld from the people by ecclesiastical authority, or where earnest seekers after God are driven from the Bible by the dogmas of traditional orthodoxy, how can the grace of God flow to them through the Scriptures? Those who restrain them from the Bible have the blame of keeping them from this gate of the Kingdom of God. The only ways of access left them are the church and the reason. And if they have not been taught to use the reason as a means of access to God, God's Spirit will make the church an avenue of grace.

It is our contention that each one of the channels of divine grace should be cleared of obstructions; that each one should be made free and open to the use of man. Then, in our opinion, Holy Scripture will rise into acknowledged superiority over them all.

IV.—HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The chief reason why men do not universally recognize the supremacy of Holy Scripture is that the scholastics and tradi-

tionalists have thrust the Scriptures aside, have encased them in speculative dogma, and have used dogmatic theories of the Bible as a wall to fence off earnest, truth-seeking men. We present several of these dogmatic utterances.

"The Presbyterian Church, in unison with all evangelical Christians, teaches that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, having been given by the immediate and plenary inspiration of God, are both in meaning and verbal expression the Word of God to man."

"A proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine, but the Scripture's claims, and therefore its inspiration in making those claims."

"Every book is genuine which was esteemed genuine by those who lived nearest to the time when it was written, and by the ages following, in a continued series."

"So far as the Old Testament is concerned, those books, and those only, which Christ and his Apostles recognized as the written word of God are entitled to be regarded as canonical. . . . The principle on which the canon of the New Testament is determined is equally simple. Those books, and those only, which can be proved to have been written by the Apostles, or to have received their sanction, are to be recognized as of divine authority."

"If, as one asserts, 'the great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names are lost in oblivion,' it was written by uninspired men. . . . This would be the inspiration of indefinite persons like Tom, Dick, and Harry, whom nobody knows, and not of definite historical persons like Moses and David, Matthew and John, chosen by God by name and known to men."

These are specimens of the statements of the dogmaticians of our day, and of the traditional theories of the Bible that prevail among the ministry. They claim that inspiration is *verbal*; the Bible is *inerrant* in every particular; the *traditional* authors of the Biblical books must have written them; the canon accepted by the *primitive* church must be accepted by us. These dogmatic utterances are insisted upon as if they were orthodox, and yet in fact there is not a creed in Christendom that indorses them; there is no Biblical authority for them; they are purely speculations and traditions, without any binding authority whatever. These dogmas confront a scientific study of the Bible.

1. The critical study of the canon shows clearly that the Christian Church has never been in concord on this subject. The Roman Catholic Church follows the broader canon of St. Augustine and the Septuagint version of the Old Testament. Protestants follow the stricter canon of St. Jerome and the Jewish synod of Jamnia. But not a few of the writings of the stricter canon were disputed by Jew and Christian. And the Christian writers of the ante-Nicene age used as Holy

Scripture several writings which are not in the Augustinian canon. The Roman Catholics build their canon on the authority of the living historical church. The Reformers built their canon upon the authority of the divine Spirit speaking in Holy Scripture to the believer.

"We know these books to be canonical and the sure rule of our faith, not so much by the common accord and consent of the church, as by the testimony and inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit, which enables us to distinguish them from the ecclesiastical books."—(Gallican Confession, IV.)

The modern Rationalists test the canon by the reason. But modern Evangelicalism builds not on the judgment of the nineteenth century, but the judgment of the second and third centuries; not on the authority of the living church, but on the authority of the dead church. It has abandoned the internal divine evidence of canonicity, and destroyed the base of Protestantism. It builds on an uncertain, fluctuating tradition, and in that tradition selects the narrower rather than the broader line.

2. Textual criticism destroys the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Language is the vehicle, the dress, of thought. Thought may find expression in any one of a thousand languages; it may be dressed in a great variety of synonymes, phrases, and literary forms, in any highly-developed language. The form may vary indefinitely, and yet the meaning be essentially the same. The divine communication to the prophet's mind, and the inspiration to give it utterance by pen or tongue, does not necessarily carry with it the inspiration of the tongue in its utterances or the pen in its constructions. No creed in Christendom teaches verbal inspiration.

I shall quote a few English Presbyterians of the seventeenth century, who had great influence in the formation of the Puritan faith.

"All language or writing is but the vessel, the symbol, or declaration of the rule, not the rule itself." "For it is not the shell of the words, but the kernel of the matter, which commends itself to the consciences of men, and that is the same in all languages." "The Scripture stands not in *cortice verborum* but in *medulla sensus*; it is the same wine in this vessel which was drawn out of that." "The Scriptures in themselves are a lanthorn rather than a light; they shine indeed, but it is *alieno lumine*; it is not their own, but a borrowed light." *

These are testimonies of Lyford, Poole, Vines, and Wallis, among the most distinguished scholars of their time. They com-

* See Briggs's "Whither?" p. 66. Chas. Scribner's Sons.

pare the words of Scripture to vessels, symbols, shells, wine-glass, lantern. The divine word is in the contents, the rule itself, the kernel, the wine, the light. Textual criticism finds no difficulty with these ancient divines and their doctrine of inspiration, but it casts off the modern dogma of verbal inspiration as the shroud of divine truth, the grave-clothes of the Word of God.

3. The higher or literary criticism on purely scientific principles determines the integrity, authenticity, literary forms, and credibility of the Scriptures. It works with the same rules that are used in every other department of the world's literature. These principles are: 1. The writing must be in accordance with its supposed historic position as to time, place, and circumstances. 2. Differences of style imply differences of experience and age of the same author, or, when sufficiently great, differences of author and period of composition. 3. Differences of opinion and conception imply differences of author when these are sufficiently great, and also differences of period of composition. 4. Citations show the dependence of author upon author, or authors cited. 5. Positive testimony. 6. The argument from silence.* The application of these rules to the scientific study of the Bible has shown that a large part of the traditions as to authorship, date, style, and integrity have no solid ground. As I recently said in my inaugural address:

"Traditionalists are crying out that it is destroying the Bible, because it is exposing their fallacies and follies. It may be regarded as the certain result of the science of the Higher Criticism that Moses did not write the Pentateuch or Job; Ezra did not write Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah; Jeremiah did not write Kings or Lamentations; David did not write the Psalter, but only a few of the Psalms; Solomon did not write the Song of Songs or Ecclesiastes, and only a portion of the Proverbs; Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name. The great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names or connection with their writings are lost in oblivion. If this is destroying the Bible, the Bible is destroyed already. But who tells us that these traditional names were the authors of the Bible? The Bible itself? The creeds of the Church? Any reliable, historical testimony? None of these! Pure conjectural tradition! Nothing more!"—("Authority of Holy Scripture," p. 33. Chas. Scribner's Sons.)

Higher criticism cuts up the dogmatic theory of the Bible from the roots. If the traditional dogma be corrrect, higher criticism, for all who accept its conclusions, has destroyed the inspiration of a large part of the Bible. The dogmaticians and

* See Briggs's "Biblical Study, pp. 87 *seq.* Chas. Scribner's Sons.

those who follow them must battle with higher criticism in a life-and-death struggle. They have identified Bible and creed with their dogma, and they are risking everything on the issue of the struggle. But higher criticism has no difficulty in dealing with them. We ask them who wrote the orphan Psalms and the Epistle to the Hebrews. They cannot tell us. Are these books to go out of their canon because they were written by "Tom, Dick, and Harry," whom we do not know to be inspired? And even if we could find authors for all the Biblical books, how can we prove the inspiration of the writers except from the books? And yet we are asked to accept these very books because they were written by these inspired men. On such a vicious circle the dogmaticians build their faith.

Higher criticism finds no more difficulty in accepting the inspiration of those great unknown poets who wrote the book of Job and the exilic Isaiah than it does of the prophets Hosea and Micah, respecting whom there is no doubt. The Epistle to the Hebrews is as divine as the Epistle to the Romans; the name of Paul does not add a feather's weight to its authority. We determine the inspiration of the writer from the inspiration of the book, and we determine the inspiration of the book from its internal character and the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in it to the believer. The same Holy Spirit who guided holy men to produce the writings gives assurance to those who use them that they are the Word of God.

"The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God."—(West. Conf., I., 4.)

4. The chief struggle between Biblical criticism and the traditional dogma is about the question of inerrancy. No word of Holy Scripture, no sentence of historic creed, makes this claim for the Bible. It is a theory of modern dogmaticians. Biblical criticism finds errors in Holy Scripture in great numbers. These errors are in the circumstantials, and not in the essentials. They do not disturb any doctrine; they do not change the faith and life of the Christian Church. The great reformers, Calvin and Luther, recognized errors in the Scriptures; Baxter and Rutherford were not anxious about them; the greatest theologians of modern Germany, Van Oosterzee, Tholuck, Neander, Stier,

Lange, Dorner, Delitzch, do not ignore them. Where is the German scholar of any rank who denies them? British scholars such as Sanday, Cheyne, Driver, Gore, Davidson, Bruce, Dods, Blaikie; American scholars such as Schaff, Fisher, Thayer, Harper, Smyth, Evans, H. P. Smith, Francis Brown, and hosts of others, frankly point them out. It may be regarded as the consensus of Biblical scholars that the Bible is not inerrant; and yet the dogmaticians insist that *one* error destroys its inspiration. They battle in death-struggle for their dogma because their Bible shares in its defeat. They risk their whole Bible on a single error. One error in citation, one error in natural history, in astronomy, in geology, in chronology, destroys the whole Bible for them. It is now generally admitted that there are errors in the present text, but it is claimed that the original autographs as they first came from their authors were inerrant. But how can they prove this? It is pure speculation in the interest of their dogma. Criticism does not find the number of errors decreasing; they rather increase as we work our way back in the study of manuscripts, versions, and citations, and advance in the critical analysis of the literature. It discredits the entire work of criticism to speculate as to another text than the best one we can get after the most patient and painstaking study.

Biblical criticism pursues its work in a purely scientific spirit. It will detect, recognize, and point out errors wherever it may find them in Holy Scripture. If the Reformers and Puritans, the great Biblical scholars of the past, have maintained their faith in the Bible notwithstanding the errors they have seen in it, it is improbable that the Biblical critics of our day will be disturbed by them. If any one is disturbed, it will be those who have been misled by the dogmaticians to rest their faith on the doctrine of inerrancy. These will ere long find the doctrine a broken reed that will give them a severe fall and shock to their faith, if it does not pierce them to the heart with the bitter agony of perplexity and doubt.

5. The science of Biblical interpretation has been greatly advanced in our day. This advance has dislodged not a few proof-texts of systems of divinity, and destroyed numberless sermons. This in itself excites the hostility of large numbers of ministers to the newer exegesis.

6. The improvement in Biblical history, with its helps, Biblical geography, archæology, natural history, has changed the face of Biblical study.

V.—BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

The most important department of recent Biblical science is Biblical theology. Biblical theology rests upon Biblical criticism. It has to determine the theology of each document by itself, then to compare the theologies of the documents and ascertain those things in which they agree and those in which they differ. This work proceeds through the entire Bible, until at length the unity and variety of Holy Scripture is discerned and then set forth in its entirety. Biblical theology traces the development of every doctrine, every form of religion, and every phase of morals. Nothing is overlooked that is found in the Bible.

Biblical theology is the youngest of the daughters of Biblical science. The writer of this article was, if he mistake not, the first in this country to write upon the subject and to attempt a complete course of lectures upon it.

The study of Biblical theology puts dogmatic theology to a severe test. In Germany it long since forced a reconstruction of dogmatics. The great systematic theologians of our time, such as Dorner, Martensen, Van Oosterzee, Müller, Kahnis, Ritschl, build upon it. But few American dogmaticians have studied it. They persist in methods, lines of argumentation, and a use of proof-texts which have long since been discarded in Europe. The present theological crisis is due largely to the resistance to Biblical theology on the part of the dogmaticians and their pupils, representing the great majority of the ministry, who were trained under the old methods. They have been taught that dogmatic theology is only a systematic expression of the doctrine of the Bible.

But Biblical theology makes it clear that these systems are chiefly speculative, and that, if they were reduced to their Biblical dimensions, their authors would hardly recognize them. Like a big orange, with thick skin and a mass of pulp, they yield little juice. These dogmatic systems neglect large masses of Holy Scripture; they depreciate some Biblical doctrines of great importance and exaggerate others of little importance, and so the whole face of Biblical doctrine is changed. Let any one study the proof-texts in the indexes of the favorite systems of dogma used in America, and he will at once see the significance of what

has been said. There is a capricious use of the Bible which is the reverse of systematic. There is a piling-up of huge masses of dogma on a few innocent texts, and a brief mention of those comprehensive Biblical statements such as Luther named little Bibles. I yield to no one in admiration of a true systematic theology such as those attempted by Henry B. Smith and Isaac A. Dorner, Martensen, Kahnis, and Van Oosterzee. These theologians aim at a complete system built upon philosophy and science, Bible and history, church and creed. But those American dogmatic systems that depreciate the reason and then go to extremes in dogmatic speculation; that ignore Biblical theology and then search the Bible with a lantern for props for their dogmas; that turn their backs on the historical church and institutional Christianity, and then chase every shadow of tradition that may seem to give them support, however feeble,—such systems are but castles in the air, schoolboys' bubbles, the delight of a body of ministers in a period of transition, but without the slightest substantial contribution to the faith and life of the generations to come.

VI.—LAST THINGS.

We have exhausted our space in the study of the first things. We must sketch rapidly the topics that remain. The last things embrace death, the middle state, the resurrection, and the Messianic judgment with its rewards and penalties. The Reformers rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatory, but did not state a Protestant doctrine of the middle state. They concentrated their attention upon justification by faith at the beginning of the Christian life; they did not unfold the whole doctrine of redemption. The field of eschatology was left by them in a very obscure condition. They simply maintained the old church doctrine after they had stripped off the Roman Catholic errors. They made no advance at this point. Great changes have taken place in the Christian world since the Reformation. The neglect of infant baptism and church membership by the masses in Christendom, the opening-up of the heathen world in numbers greatly exceeding the nominal Christian world, have compelled earnest men to ask the question how infants can be saved, and how the heathen, any of them, may be redeemed in accordance with the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith. Increased attention to Christian ethics and the doctrine of

sanctification has raised the question how men dying imperfect and unsanctified are to be sanctified. These questions are not answered by the creeds. They have been considered only in a very inadequate way in the traditional dogma. They demand a more thorough investigation and scientific statement. The Christian world is agitated on all these questions, and the theological crisis is largely due to these discussions. There is great need of patience, charity, independent and fearless investigation, while they are in debate. The doctrine of progressive sanctification after death is built on the Bible and the creeds. It is in conflict with traditional dogma, but not with any decision of the historic church. It is a doctrine which lies at the root of purgatory, but is not purgatory. It is a divine discipline, not a human probation. It is in harmony with all the doctrines that have been defined in the creeds. It banishes from the mind the terror of a judgment immediately after death, and the illusion of a magical transformation in the dying hour, and it presents in their stead a heavenly university, a school of grace, an advance in sanctity and glory in the presence of the Messiah and the saintly dead, which is a blessed hope to the living and a consolation to the suffering and the dying.

VII.—THE CHRIST.

Jesus Christ is the pivot of history, the centre of theology, the light and joy of the world. No age has been so intent upon the study of the person, life, and work of Jesus Christ as the present age. The life of Jesus has been the theme of the greatest writers of our day, and yet no theme is so fresh and inspiring. The profoundest theological treatises of the century have used all the powers of the human mind in their efforts to understand and to explain the unique personality of our Redeemer. The traditional dogma unfolded the Christ of the cross and the atonement wrought thereon, but the Christ of the throne and the heavenly mediation have been neglected. Modern Christology is unfolding the humiliation of Christ, the Kenosis of the second person of the trinity, the incarnation, the resurrection, the second advent of our Lord. All these phases of Christology are in course of evolution. They cast a flood of light upon the whole field of theology, and are gradually transforming every other doctrine. As Henry B. Smith well said: "What reformed theology has got to do is to Christologize predestination and decrees; regeneration and sancti-

fication; the doctrine of the church; and the whole of eschatology." There are new difficulties and contests about all these questions. German theology is agitated over the mode of the incarnation—whether it was instantaneous or gradual; over the Kenosis, and the construction of the complex nature of the Redeemer. Anglican theology is agitated with regard to the virgin birth of our Lord and the nature of the resurrection body. Many of the Evangelicals are especially interested in the doctrine of the second advent. Each party is doing its work in the unfolding of some special section of Christianity. American Christianity is backward still in the department of Christology; but ere long it will become the most absorbing, as it is ever the grandest, theme for the Christian Church, and the first things and the last things will be absorbed in the blaze of the glory of the Messiah.

VIII.—THE GAIN.

The fruits of this theological crisis can only be great, lasting, and good. The first things, the sources and foundations of Christianity, will be tested, strengthened, and assured. The living God will approach men who use all the media of divine influence, and grant them union and communion as never before. Vital union with the living God will make living Christians, a living church, and doctrines animated with holy living and doing.

The last things will cease to frighten weak Christians, and stiffen brave men into the rejection of such childish conceptions of the universe as prevail in the traditional dogma. They will become the hope and joy, the comfort and consolation, of manly, heroic Christians ready to do and dare for Christ and his kingdom.

Jesus Christ, in his unique personality, in the wonders of his theanthropic nature, in the comprehension of his work of redemption, will present himself to the consciousness of men as their loving Master and gracious Sovereign, whom to love, serve, and adore will be the bliss of living and dying. "To be well-pleasing to Christ" will be the one end and aim of the Christian world.

It is evident that the evolutions of Christian theology which have brought on the theological crisis are preparing the way for a new Reformation, in which it is probable that all the Christian churches will share; each one, under the influence of the divine Spirit, making its own important contribution to the world-wide movement, whose goal is the unity of the church and the redemption of the world.

C. A. Briggs.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

CAN LYING BE JUSTIFIED?

As a matter of cold-blooded ethics, should the truth be proclaimed at the price of life, liberty, and reputation? As a matter of cold-blooded ethics, should the young so be taught, and their elders so set the example?

While all moral advancement of a people must rest upon a proper standard of truth in their intercourse with each other, yet this question has not been squarely met, for even the most truth-loving evade the issue. If the principles of truth *could* be so thoroughly instilled into a race, or a nation, or a generation, that it would be a daily spectacle to see fathers testifying against their children, and children against their parents, and friends against their dearest friends, although their lives, liberties, and reputations were at stake, simply because they were telling the truth, would it be a desirable condition of affairs?

Is there not something in the nature of man that revolts against the spectacle of seeing another jeopardize the life, liberty, or reputation of one he should protect, no matter how much he is a lover of truth? In real life we know absolutely that this law of man's nature has been so well met that it is now conceded in our courts that a wife is not compelled to testify against a husband, nor a husband against a wife, nor is the prisoner at the bar compelled to testify against himself. He is not required to be put to this test of whether he will tell the truth against himself or take refuge in the protection to be found in swearing falsely.

But in daily life this question is not so easily answered: we evade it, and so push away the sense of responsibility we ought to meet. No man, no woman, knows but that some day he or she may be brought face to face with this problem. How to meet it is the question. Have we the right to so answer that the life, liberty, or reputation of a loved one, or a friendless one, or a fugitive who looks to us for protection, shall be taken away, simply that the cold-blooded edicts of truth shall be satisfied? Or is the truth in such a case to be held up aloft in the face of every vicissitude and at every sacrifice?

The literature of a people reflects the ethics of the mind and sentiments common and prevailing among that people, for there the moral purpose and standard should prevail, if anywhere. But upon this subject there is a conflict in our literature. The question is not answered. In the Old Testament the story is told of Rahab, a woman of no character, who concealed the spies of Israel in her house, and, when questioned, swore that they were not there. For this lie she was rewarded. After the destruction of the place she and her

family were protected, and the name of Rahab was handed down to be honored as long as the tribes of Israel should exist. In the New Testament, Ananias and Sapphira swore falsely to save their reputations, and were struck dead.

Walter Scott, in his novel "The Heart of Mid-Lothian," met the question fairly and squarely in the case of Jeanie Deans. Her sister was on trial for her life, suspected of infanticide, though it could not be absolutely proved. Jeanie Deans was called on to testify whether her sister had ever talked to her upon the subject of the coming of the child, or whether she had been seen making any preparation for its reception such as mothers make, which questions, answered in the affirmative, would establish a degree of proof of innocence. The old father stood anxiously awaiting each word, and then turned to Jeanie, not doubting that she would say "Yes," even if it were not true, since her sister's life hung upon her answer. But poor Jeanie burst into tears and replied, "No"; and her sister was sentenced in consequence.

Victor Hugo has met the question fairly and squarely also, but from a point directly opposite. In his masterpiece of "Les Misérables" he presents the picture of the degraded galley-slave, who has robbed the good bishop of his silver plates, and, being captured, is brought back to be confronted by the bishop. The wretch knows that this means the galleys for life, but to his surprise the good bishop says: "Oh! I presented him with these plates. I have been waiting for you to return—you forgot to take the candlesticks also—they are solid silver and will bring you quite a sum." As a result of this lie, the convict becomes an honored man, but the police are still on his trail, and about to take him, when he escapes by means of a room where sits a Sister of Mercy, who tells the police an untruth—she says he did not pass that way. And upon these two lies, one of a bishop, the other of a Sister of Mercy, hangs the character of Jean Valjean, one of the greatest in literature.

In the play of the "Two Orphans," a popular melodrama for the past sixteen years, the persecuted Henriette is sentenced to a convict colony in Cayenne. As the officer enters the prison to point out the convicts who are to be shipped away, a Sister of Mercy enables her to escape by the simple act of nodding "No" as he points to Henriette. And as an evidence of popular feeling on this subject there is always a great burst of applause at this point—applause for the lie which gives Henriette her freedom.

In the day of slavery, in pursuance of the system of what was called "The Underground Railway," each truthful answer to the slave-drivers in search of their victims resulted in the capture of the hapless fugitive, and the condemning of him again to the lash of slavery. Question: Was the truth commendable under such circumstances? and should the youth of our land be so taught?

There is a well-known story of a daughter of Revolutionary times who hid a prisoner of war under the linen she was bleaching, and allowed the pursuing British to think he had passed on, and thus saved his life. The fact that she equivocated with the truth has no bearing on the question. A lie with the lips and a lie by silence each has the same intent to deceive. Practically there is no difference, for it often happens that half a truth, unmodified, is a lie. The question is, "Was she justified, or should her course be condemned? Was it heroic, or was it wrong?"

A popular saying which bears on this subject has sprung into existence, and, showing its popularity, has travelled to the western coast of America from England in the last few years. It serves as a moral standard regarding truth being spoken at the price of reputation. The Prince of Wales was

called upon to testify against a woman's character, and a feeling of respect is aroused by the commendation "that he perjured himself like a gentleman"!

Is there a higher law than the law? Is there an ethical point beyond pure ethics, that human nature feels intuitively this peculiar sense of heroism in telling what is not strictly true in order to save life, liberty, and reputation? Or is life a small thing, and liberty a small thing, and reputation a small thing to place beside the truth?

Ought all things, even a mother's love, and a wife's devotion, and a sister's honor, to be sacrificed to preserve the truth intact?

ELLA STERLING CUMMINS.

TO WOMEN NOT DUMB.

FROM the very nature of her life, interests, social up-bringing, and social atmosphere, woman is the sex that everlastingly shows the least moral and intellectual responsibility about the use of language. It sometimes seems as if any conscience or understanding of the value of words, and of what a phrase means or does not mean, is not to be found in the sex. A word is a short cut to expressing an idea. Women dash for it involuntarily, with as little premeditation as they dart through the first gap in the hedge, with flying skirts, if a red cow looks at them attentively in crossing the field. Men have to consider consequences in words and sentences; men have to reflect, even in a twinkling, that yea is yea and nay is nay, and that a blow from the shoulder or the payment of a check is a material consequence of what and how a thing is talked over with somebody else.

But woman, incorrigible, heedless, talky, injudicious, and indiscriminate woman! what shall be done with you?—you irritating, delightful, perfectly irresponsible creature in your use of adjectives and qualifying clauses, whether you are describing how you missed a train, or enjoyed a ball, or saw a street fight! Have you no conscience in your picturesque loquacity? Do you wish to go on exaggerating, ly—yes, lying, misrepresenting facts, in your charming desire to tell your own story in your own way? Will no god of accuracy cry, "Hold, enough," and stop you in your mad career, and either at one fell swoop reduce your vocabulary to one of laconic sort or else enlighten you as to the truth that words are the great disguisers of what we have known and seen and felt?

O women! you who are not dumb, nor (if you can possibly help it) taciturn and reticent, miserly of talk! refer the question back to fundamental principles. If you have really, at the bottom of your heart, the wish to do things honestly, correctly, no matter how trivial the things be, and because truth is lovely, do, for pity's sake, speak accurately, use good English and just phrases. It is so easy, so *very* easy, if you will only think about words and remember that words are ideas, and that one cannot lay aside brains and common-sense with any excuse when talking begins. You cannot push away influence in a sentence's course. You are morally a surety for a story's being told truthfully as to every adjective, accurately as to each phrase, with reasonable precision as to every clause, and in sentences that, furthermore, will bear all the grammatical tests that education in your youth should enable them to sustain.

Now, this does not mean the precisian's and purist's way. It does not kill colloquialism. It means merely thinking a little of *how* you are expressing yourself, and of how honestly you are conveying your facts. Opin-

ion is a fact. Convey it as a fact. The society woman, in particular, has become so inconsiderate a narrator that men are becoming more and more impressed with a woman's clear and accurate phraseology, as the outward and visible sign of a responsible mind behind it. In very young women inaccuracy is pardonable, along with sentimentality, romping, and quick temper. But in the woman long out of school and in the thirties it is intolerable.

Lovely woman, hearken yet again! Do not use sixpenny words when penny ones are your honestest commodity. Avoid the usually false, mischievous word "very," that adds so little to a clause. Do not forget that a sentence you begin must needs have an end. Remember that every time you use a misrepresenting word you are not living up to your moral and intellectual duty, even if you describe only a bonnet.

"But," say you, "it is hard to get into this straight road—all the harder if one has walked out of it long since. I wish I could always say just what I mean to say. But I fear I cannot get to doing it." There is a remedy, my inaccurate sister, a good, simple remedy. Correct yourself sharply, immediately, whenever you lapse from truth to fact and the idea in your heart. Do it at once—even twice—in a sentence. Take back what you have uttered, and substitute the truth; qualify and hedge. After a little of this process—tiresome at first—you will be astonished to find how alert you are growing to expressing things as they should be said. The practice works wonders. You will be transformed, little by little, from an exaggerator to an accurate creature; from a liar to a truth-speaker.

Words are the index to mind, to character. More women are uninteresting and inconsequent to men, more women fail to win men with brains for husbands, because they are indiscriminating speakers, thus arguing indiscriminating minds, than because the hair is carroty, the nose flat, the complexion less ruddy than the cherry, or Worth gowns dear array. Either matrimonially or in any other way estimated, talk is *not* cheap.

E. IRENÆUS STEVENSON.

SELFISHNESS AS A PRESERVATIVE.

SELFISHNESS, which is universally detected, at least in others, is naturally not without advantage to its possessor. Indeed, it could not be otherwise, and remain selfishness. Any one would believe that its advantage would be exclusively material, such as an altruistic person would be ashamed of, and would regard, in any high sense, as a disadvantage. And so it would be, if the conventional moral theories were correct. Unhappily, they are not; many of them, when submitted to the test of human nature, proving unadulteratedly false.

How can selfishness be an advantage even to its practiser? Every one concedes it to be the supreme vice; for it contributes more than any other one thing to the sum of human wretchedness, and retards more than any other the progress of ethical development. Its advantage may be seen in the appearance and quality of the selfish everywhere, if they be carefully and continuously studied.

Select any one of your acquaintances particularly noted for selfishness of a refined sort, and scrutinize him. Is he haggard, careworn, conscience-stricken, as a man concerned only for himself, indifferent to the misery and suffering of his fellows, ought to be? On the contrary, he looks plump, serene, content. Is this but a mask? Is there an invisible canker at his

heart? He wears no mask; he has no canker. He is all that he seems. They who know him best will tell you his temper is ever placid, his mind ever at rest. They cannot but envy his disposition, be the cause what it may. He claims to be a philosopher, to have pondered the aims and outcomes of life, to have adjusted them to the law of his own being. You observe the fortunate result. He is too finely selfish to admit his selfishness and his non-admission reveals his selfishness most.

Women are, as a sex, far less selfish than men; but, when they are selfish, they are apt to be extremely, though speciously, daintily, artistically selfish, and to draw those wholly unlike themselves. Who does not know such women? They are more attractive in appearance than the majority of their sex; being better in health, freer in mind, calmer in spirit. Youth seems to belong to them. At fifty, and more, they do not begin to look their years. Many are actresses, musicians, opera-singers, who attain high fame and excite great enthusiasm. It might be thought that Art, in any form, would demand imagination, sympathy, power of identification with other natures. So it does. But the sympathy is mental, emotional only; it does not reach the soul; it does not last; it soon becomes professional. The power of identification subsides into a trick, a habit, and is ruled by the will. Emotion is one of the thinnest, the most deceptive, of phenomena. It finds its fullest expression in music, which appears to be the most spiritual of the Arts. Music carries him who listens, and responds, beyond the soar of sense, to the very zenith of aspiration. But she who produces it may, apart from the sensuous throb and glow of the moment, be coldly conceited and calculating. How often are musicians, who can make others see the unseen, and believe in the incredible, the most fleshly and self-seeking of mortals!

Emotionalism does not necessarily spring from feeling, in a true sense: it is not seldom compatible with the absence of feeling. She who, on the stage, can force tears from a thousand eyes, who can set even the hearts of belledom and fashion quivering, may not feel the faintest swell from the distant wave of grief. Emotionalism and selfishness are entirely consistent. The one frequently screens and sharpens the other, to make it more effective. Emotional selfishness may waste and destroy those against whom it is directed; but they who generate it are prone to live long and keep young. The tragedies of selfishness are for its dupes; the comedies and crowns are for its inheritors and agents.

Who are the women in social circles that win and hold the most desirable men? Are they the affectionate, the devoted, the generous, the self-sacrificing? Are they not the selfish, the scheming, the ambitious, who preserve themselves fresh and fair; who create their opportunities; who seize their occasions; who sight their possibilities by sedulous, unsparing selfishness? The generous waste themselves physically and mentally in looking after others, in trying to do good, in lifting burthens that are not theirs. They are weary, worn, exhausted, past usefulness, when their selfish sisters, still in their prime, smile pity on them, and go bounding away with the lightness that comes from a shut-up heart and a withered conscience.

Selfish women are inevitably the poorest wives, but generally the best preserved, and most appreciated by their husbands, and other men. They either have no children or but one or two; and these they give over completely to nurses, on the theory that mothers should save themselves for the children's sake. How favorably they compare, or contrast, with the wives to whom marriage is a consecration, or, as they say, a superstition! They

boast that they are not broken down with domestic drudgery, with household vassalage, and instance, in derision, some women who are. They certainly are not. They are supple, active, in superb condition. They appear interesting as specimens, though they may not bear study. Having lavished their time and thought on themselves, they have done it with manifest profit, outwardly at least. They brag of their freedom, and surely they have excess of it, material and moral, and are warranted in saying that they are often supposed to be single. They have, in some cases, cured their husbands of a misplaced affection, or, more frequently, have taught them to expect little by yielding almost nothing. Always they have been the gainers, as they count gain, by the steady pursuit of a well-managed selfishness.

Husbands are gainers in the same way by selfishness; their wives, of course, being unselfish. If they were both alike, there would be no bond; or, if there were a bond, it would speedily be dissolved. Strong attractions exist only between opposites. It is the rule of Nature and Destiny that selfishness draws generosity, and that generosity solicits selfishness. In the allotment of humanity, in which more or less satire is mingled, the good and the bad are oftenest mated. A selfish man gets control of a generous woman, or a generous man falls into the clutches of a selfish woman.

The selfish husband, who is to be found twenty times where the selfish wife is to be found once, is made doubly selfish by his generous partner. She is ever urging him to the course he would unfailingly follow; and he assumes to be self-indulgent for her sake alone. "Poor fellow, he needs this or that; dear man, he requires some change, some relaxation, a little pleasure." This is ever her strain. While he rests, she toils; while he enjoys, she suffers. She adores him, and he neglects her. What a pattern of health, serenity, and egotism he; what a picture of pallor, nervousness, and abasement she! She probably dies, regretting her unfulfilled duty to him; and he discovers a younger woman to enslave, and impose upon, while she lasts. To every selfish man an unbroken line of generous victims is always decreed. He is cheerful, buoyant, provided for, to the end; and the end is usually a felicitous chance, a favor of fortune.

Vulgar, untrained selfishness is rarely dangerous. It repels; is forced back on itself, and catches no lures. But selfishness of the cultivated order, which is the commonest, is commanding, complacent, comfortable. It has an air of saintliness, and the enterprise and conceit of an imp. Seldom does it meet with pain or sorrow. Protected within and without, it goes smoothly and safely to its goal. And its aspect is always calm and propitious; for its insensibility is assured, its hardness guaranteed. Material prosperity attends it, and it cares for none other. Such selfishness is discoverable on all sides; but many perceive it not until it has been pointed out; and then their vision may not be clear. Eulogies greet it often, and monuments are built to its memory. All history bears witness to it, and it is amply illustrated in our contemporaries. One example serves for another; for, with all its variations, it is the same at bottom.

One of the most significant instances of unalloyed, vicious selfishness is that of Marshal de Richelieu, great-nephew of the famous Cardinal. So delicate at birth that he was kept alive, and coddled for months, in a basket of finest wool, he flourished to be a disgrace to his nation, and a stain on humanity. Charming women loved him; noble men honored him; kings advanced him; the fairest fortune attended him; blessings unnumbered steadily dropped into his hands. He died in his ninety-third year, as one

who falls asleep, on the afternoon of a beautiful day, the summer sky bending over him as in benison. His entire career was an apotheosis of selfishness.

The life of Richelieu carries a moral against morality. It is a monstrous sarcasm on accepted ideas of ethics. But who shall say that his entirely unmerited rewards are not representative of natures akin to his and all his kind?

JUNIUS HENRI BROWNE.

MIDDLE-AGED WOMEN.

MIDDLE age embraces the ideally delightful years of life, midway between the chaotic fervors of youth and the calm decline of age. In this entrancing period a woman rejoices in the redundant charms of her mature beauty, in her increasing mental brilliancy, in her enlarging number of deeds accomplished, and of personal experiences, which are like invested capital for conversation.

Young people are apt to regard it as a kind of living burial, for it is forgotten that youth is only the time of acrobatic performance and animal vigor. But middle life can never have the exuberance which properly belongs to it until society rejects the forced necessity of compelling its votaries to be buds, of "coming out"; which is a most abnormal contrivance for having a good time. If buds could only realize that they will not be perfected flowers until they have reached middle life, that innocence and insipidity are not as attractive as knowledge and brilliancy, that manners are a slow process of acquirement, that babbling is not talking, they at least would not give dinner parties until they had gained the art of conversation.

Middle life has, indeed, its terrors as well as its uses and delights, according to individual appropriation of its resources. An unhappy middle-aged woman is only less unhappy than an old woman. The frivolity of existence reaches its height through a selfish, senseless, mawkish, vapid, middle-aged woman. She knows people's histories if they are ignoble; she spends her summers on hotel piazzas, belittling those whom she meets; she adores "Mémoires" calling up the scandal of the past history and the gossip of the present town topics. She appeals to men for their judgment about her investments, as a prelude to would-be intimacy; she avoids any allusion to higher education except thereby to suggest the loss of the domestic arts, of which she knows nothing. She is a social parasite and goes to Europe or Florida to make acquaintances.

There is one curious fact about middle life which is full of significance. Women are less criminal than men, for prostitution and maternity, though differing widely as causes, yet produce a similar effect in lessening crime; but whereas among men the maximum of criminality is about the age of twenty-five, in women it is delayed till nearly thirty-five. In every class of criminals the average age of women is higher than that of men. Among 130 women condemned for murder the average age was thirty-four. In Spain, as women are still domestic, there is little crime among them, while in England, where there is increasing participation of women in affairs outside of the home itself, there has been a steady increase in the proportion of women criminals, until it is now more than one in four, and in reformatory and industrial schools the proportion of girls who go astray is double that of boys. In America crime among women is not at present so well defined; still it points to middle life as its period of fertility.

When we judge of human life as a whole, we say with glad truth that

woman is as good as man, or, if we have been snubbed, we say she is better than man. When a middle-aged woman is but kindly and tedious, she is merely a bore acting as a mental nettle-rash upon the sensitive consciences of her friends, who torment themselves by trying to like her. Yet it is far harder to be tiresome to one's self than to one's friends. An ordinary, amiable person well knows she is stupid, and is always trying to do little kind deeds in extenuation of her unattractive speech or unengaging manners. She offers her usefulness as atonement for her dulness.

We all have the middle-aged friends who make us long visits, and hear our domestic troubles as we unfold to them our theories of what ought to be, their delicacy hiding from us their suspicion that our ideas of perfection are drawn from our personal disappointments. When death enters our households, we cast ourselves upon their strength, and are borne through the crises of sorrow, as they prove themselves shining examples of the use of being average women. Each home needs one.

There is yet another kind of middle-aged woman who emerges from youth. There lurks within her a sweet tenacity of will which bids her embrace every opportunity for improvement. She talks little of what she wants to be, caring most for a sense of proportion in all she does. She studies the mystery of success, and, as she finds that it lies largely in personalities, she imbibes the secret of grace and is full of sympathy for the incompleteness of others. Whether her sphere is large or small, she stamps herself upon it. Her conversation is not of quotations—that dreamy subterfuge for real culture. She does not begin a *tête-a-tête* by talking of Howells's place in literature, nor preface every remark by the mock humility of "it seems to me." She proves her point by apt illustration and takes far-reaching views of every question. She is too keen to avoid sentiment and emotion, as therein lie power and like beauty; she accepts their use as weapons for the conversion of others. She stands equipped for service, and is to us as Comte's priestess of humanity. Ceres and Juno were always over forty; Venus and Proserpine were young and made mistakes.

Evenings are a trying part of middle life. Men go out; women stay at home. Surely there ought to be evening clubs for ladies, to which they could go unattended, where they, too, could play billiards or cards, or read the papers and talk about them. As it is, a boarding-house with a general parlor is more sociable than an elegant drawing-room with only one's self in it.

Middle-aged women are usually more philanthropic than literary, as a genius for literature stamps its clients early, while enthusiasm for humanity is the slow growth of accretion. Nevertheless, too many women in their zeal as workers make their enemies wish they were deaf-mutes instead of queen-bees. At the family meal they talk of the "influence of their sex," the formation of public opinion, and the need of petition, and then wonder why the men have such small appetites. They do "a little business" at afternoon teas, always and forever alert. Yet even philanthropy demands knowledge in its devotees, for, though maternal affection and mending of clothes may largely atone for wisdom in a mother, yet *all* women need *constant* education. The very *salon* which the American woman is always longing to create eludes her unless she knows how to know something. Through her *salon* she hopes to revive her earlier social prestige, or at least to establish friendships with men which shall never descend to flirtations, never exhale themselves in passion, and never consolidate themselves in marriage. To a happily-married woman intimacies with men are but subsidiary causes for enjoy-

ment, but a morbid wife can never venture upon the dangerous slope of platonic affection.

To the married woman of to-day middle life presents peculiar problems. She may be the saddest or the most joyous creature in existence. The pain of middle life is its realization of early mistakes and the perception of their self-perpetuating consequences. Even if there have been no errors, a middle-aged mother, in order to still be successful, must prove her ability for compromise. She may be queen over a house, but not over a home unless she drops all authority and allows the individuality of her grown-up sons and daughters to find an outlet in the home. She must act by suggestion rather than by initiative, often foregoing even the first method, or she will find, as so many do, that her daughters prefer college to home, and that her sons will take bachelor apartments. Even a casual observer must notice the frequency of such suites, which never would be rented by young men if their home were as freely theirs as it is their father's and mother's.

Middle life for an unmarried daughter is often very hard, for she may have no real liberty. A girl at forty ought to have her own choices just as much as if she were married. But mothers want to be solaced and fathers want their daughters "round." While even in the most questioning of homes the son is allowed some liberty, the daughter, as long as she is single, is considered as *belonging* to her parents, instead of having freedom allowed her in her pursuits, beliefs, tastes, and expenditures.

Notwithstanding the restraints of parental affection upon the unmarried and the self-imposed restraint that the married most uncomplainingly accept, middle life still remains the glorious period of life, its working season in plenitude of power. Everywhere rise up the superb hosts of women who are making civilization the product of organized and individual ability. In youth they prepared for middle life. Now they enter it and take glad possession, calling it middle life as long as there is strength to work, with every nerve and muscle trained for service, till they pass from the golden portals of successful work completed into the lambent resting-places of old age.

KATE GANNETT WELLS.

WEEPING PUGILISTS.

Αὐτάρ Ἀχιλλεὺς
δακρύσας.—"Iliad," I., 348.

"THE poor defeated pugilist broke down completely and wept like a baby." A fine little finishing touch to the press report of a famous prize-fight.

Round after round, with the patience of an ox and the grit of a bull-dog, the weaker of the two "giants" stood up, only to be sledge-hammered down again, until it became evident to his most persistent backer that the only thing he possibly could do was to stand up—with no certainty even of that. Then the sponge flew up, and the flood of briny and bloody tears came down.

Poor fellow! His physical pain and exhaustion, the scowling, muttering, swearing disgust of his "friends," who patted his red brawn and bet their sesterces upon his blood, the golden prize so ardently hoped for cut down to a beggarly share in the "gate-money" as the price of his blood and pain, and last, but not least, the loss of the champion's belt with its glittering jewels and its big gold buckle, all together proved too much for him; he broke down and blubbered like a schoolboy, or, in the more touching phrase of the press report, "wept like a baby."

If the report were read by only professional sports, loafers, gamblers, and thieves, there would be little occasion for such an article as the present one, particularly in a literary review; but the prominence given to it in the great daily papers argues a vastly greater and more respectable number of spectators.

Now, the briny drops which thus glisten like a crystal pendant at the end of the reporter's article diffentiate the slugger from the rest of mankind with quite as strong demarcation as his bull neck and head, his double joints, and his turgid muscles.

Physical pain, chagrin, financial loss (short of utter ruin), do not often wring tears from the average full-grown man. The soldier (who, by the way, fights where the typical slugger would show a clean pair of heels) endures agony without a trace of tears. The last time *he* wept for any physical cause was when, a lad at school, his brutal fool of a master was "bound to flog him till he cried." In a word, the slugger is one of the most strongly-marked examples of abnormal specialization at the expense of general development that our race affords. With unintended and unconscious pertinency, his backers and friends call him Boy, with the name of his city or county prefixed. Outside of his specialty, he *is* a boy at thirty—a very young and most generally a very bad boy. "Hence these tears." A dissection of his brain would be instructive. A perfect specimen would show arrested cerebral development compensated by abnormal development of the cerebellum. In life he prided himself on his big muscles. They were well enough in their way, but if he had understood physiological science better (he never did pretend to be a "scholar"), he would have set a higher value on the big, thick nape of his neck and the ample base of the skull just above, where resided the tremendous motive power that worked his muscular engine. Externally there is little to distinguish the dog of keenest scent from other dogs, but what wonderful olfactory *ganglia* his cranial dissection discloses!

But the slugger's imperfect cerebral development is no cause of mortification or regret to him. He is serenely unconscious of any intellectual or moral deficiency. The ridiculous adulation lavished upon him on all sides, by prince and pauper alike, even inflates his poor brain with the most absurd notions of his importance. Is not his fame international? Is not his full-length portrait seen everywhere, in every variation of the pugilistic attitude?—even in evening dress, heaven save the mark! Do not his fistic exploits fill more columns, with more startling headlines, in the great newspapers of the world, than the inventions of the mechanical genius, the discoveries of the scientist and the explorer, the most momentous of merely intellectual achievements? What wonder, then, that he should speedily get to looking upon his beastly big fist as of more consequence than all their brains? He thinks we all fall into line to do him honor, you and I with our households. "You may tell the *people*," is the great man's lofty mandate to the obsequious interviewer, "that I am ready to fight the Tuscarora Boy whenever he is ready" to do thus and so. And "the people," who are supposed to have been breathlessly waiting for this all-important announcement, are now supposed to breathe freely once more.

Now, it is of the least public consequence what the slugger, or his trainer, or his backers think; but what of the great public who read these double-leaded columns? What, especially, of the boys and girls who see them on the library table and in the reading-room? It is you, O citizens, who make the demand, and you, Messrs. Editors, who supply the demand, that are the

responsible parties. You justify your interest in the prize-ring because you claim that it is the place where is exhibited the most magnificent development of physical manhood, the culmination of virile power, skill, courage, and endurance. And so, as you are many, progressive, and influential, the great daily papers freely devote their long columns to a minute and circumstantial report of each great "mill" as it occurs. For your benefit the presidential contest itself is not more carefully and conscientiously reported than the "great international prize contest between" the two champion human beasts of the world.

The term "beasts" here sounds like invective. It is not so intended. It is used simply in the way of scientific classification. The only part of the slugger that is of the least consequence in the supreme act of his vocation is the beast part of him; the only qualities that count in the slightest degree are those which he shares with one of the beastliest of beasts, the bull-dog, to whose "magnificent courage and endurance" alone his own are inferior. His physique is magnificent indeed, but not the most so among men, as you imply. The bull-dog is far from being the most magnificent among the animals. He is as inferior to the lion as the pugilist is to the great English Tree-Chopper; he is as much below the greyhound or the racehorse as the slugger is below the electric-nerved, finely-fibred college athlete.

A few years ago the writer published a novel in which the motive is artificial selection applied to the human species. What the Duchesse d'Angoulême is among pears, what Maud S is among horses, the hero is among men.* While attributing to him intellectual and moral supremacy, the author made the mistake of giving him at the same time a physique so pronounced, so aggressive in its size and strength, that it has the unforeseen effect of dwarfing somewhat his more important and more admirable endowments. As one of his fairest critics observes,† he is "somewhat overweighted by his magnificent body. His superb limbs, his satiny skin, his immense black eyes, his thrilling voice, his Titanic appearance, his simple diet, are rather too conspicuous." If such is the effect when physical is associated with corresponding mental and moral excellence, what must it be when there is not even a pretence of the latter?

The favorite euphemism for the slugger is "the gladiator." No! the fist is not a *gladius*. There is something of sublimity, as well as of terror, attaching to the sword, but to the fist—faugh! The gladius is terrible, the fist disgusting. Its very terror redeems the gladius from vulgarity.

Pugilism was one of the exercises of the ancient *palæstra*, it is true, and, like everything else seen through the centuries, it is softened and refined by the blue haze of classic poetry and romance. The history of the race is the biography of the individual. In the youth of either the physical predominates over the intellectual and moral. Achilles was a great, handsome, passionate boy, brave as a lion, fleet as a deer, pouting, scolding, and shedding floods of angry tears, like any hot-headed, full-blooded lad of fourteen.

Centuries later, a whole nation, and that the most civilized in the world, assembled around its olympic arena like boys around their playground; and the best runner, leaper, or boxer was their hero. As representatives of the adolescent stage of our race, we can look upon their fisticuffs and their tears with charitable judgment as well as with romantic sentiment. But when the apologists for the modern prize-ring commend their clients to our equal con-

* "A Demigod." Harper & Bros. † Julian Hawthorne, in the New York *World*.

sideration and even admiration, it is somewhat as if they should excuse (or praise) a father for fighting, swearing, and blubbering in the street by pointing to his children squabbling and squalling in the nursery.

He "wept like a baby." Poor fellow! One cannot help a twinge of pity for the lachrymose giant sitting there in his pain and ignominy. It is but natural to weep with those who weep. Our pity need not be very keen, however, nor very profound. The source of those briny drops does not lie very deep; they are not the tears that come "like drops of molten iron" from the "strong man in his agony" we have all heard of and, once in a lifetime, seen. *He* does not "cry like a baby."

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

THE FUTURE OF MARRIAGE.

THAT matrimony is falling into disfavor with men and women alike is or is not true. It is, at least, constantly asserted.

From the readily-granted premise that knowledge is more wisely diffused than ever before and that women, in particular, are becoming the cultured as well as the leisure sex, it is hastily assumed that the close communion of taste and sentiment desirable in matrimony is growing more difficult of attainment; that the burdens of supporting a family are beyond the financial means of young men whose exacting tastes demand æsthetic surroundings and costly luxuries; that mothers who have suffered in marriage are teaching their daughters to abhor it; that the self-supporting women, now so large a proportion of the sex, are refusing matrimony. It is not strange that from such assumptions many have concluded that marriage is well-nigh a doomed and dying institution.

It may be—it should be—that in the future marriage will change many of its legal and social characteristics. It has changed much since history began recording human doings. It has changed within the last half-century, sweeping aside barriers of barbarism. No woman in the future—in the golden future for which candid souls hope—will promise to obey her husband, will yield up her property to his exclusive control, and her earnings thereafter, will see vested in him the sole ownership of her children, will assume the attitude of a dependent upon his bounty doled out of the common earnings, or have the reasonable right of divorce denied. But changes of law and custom will adorn and perfect marriage, not destroy it.

The excessive fineness of nerve which is expected to make, and does make, happy marriage difficult is not a necessary result of culture. It is even now less common than is supposed. It was not at all common in the historic periods which have been termed golden. Healthy physical force and abounding vitality, as well as keen wits, shone in the Periclean age in Greece, the Elizabethan in England, the early sixteenth century in Spain. The forces are already at work which will tend to correct these evils. No mightier agency for human good was ever welcomed than the present intelligent interest taken in physical development by both sexes. It is becoming the fashion to be healthy. Walking, the gymnasium, horseback riding, bowling, fencing, are resorted to, and teachers of calisthenic, Swedish, or Delsartean exercises flourish by the hundred where ten years ago they starved by dozens. Dyspepsia is no longer the national disease. The coming of rational dress for women is more slow, but progress can be reported since intelligent women both here and in England have shown how dress can be made more healthful without sacrificing beauty or shocking the conventional.

Exercise and outdoor air will drive away half the megrims which assault women, and with the corset will disappear a good proportion of the rest. The women of 1950 will be better fitted, physically and mentally, for matrimony, maternity, and the enjoyment of life than those of 1850. Our granddaughters will laugh at the spindle waists and hysterical nerves of our grandmothers. If at the same time the revolt against matrimony which certain prophets, peering forth from watch-towers, have discerned or fancied shall impress young men with the necessity, in order to win worthy wives, of living more cleanly and sober lives, abandoning tobacco, drunkenness, and lewd conversation, and studying courtesy and grave thinking, we may well thank those who have warned us, even if unnecessarily.

There is no reason to suppose that self-supporting women—or those usually so-called to distinguish them from wives and homemakers who are not less self-supporting in fact—will in the future refuse matrimony, or that they are doing so now. Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells has noted that the vast army of teachers is continually deserted for matrimony; but to support her theory of the decadence of marriage she assumes that teachers are usually women who love children and wish to have child life about them. The assumption is groundless; it would be as easy to assert, and as difficult to disprove, that teachers love children less than other women, having seen so many of their unlovely traits. But other wage-earners of the gentler sex marry. The servant leaves her employer's kitchen for a husband's meaner one which will be her own. The marrying of typewriters is proverbial. Newspaper women marry newspaper men, and put their desks within eyeshot of each other in the big offices. Doctors of unlike sex marry and divide the patients, the profits, and the work.

Fashion controls affairs the gravest and the gayest. It prescribes the funeral ceremonials. It rules in Cupid's court. Marriage is almost universal among the people who, in other respects, are fashion-leaders. Of a young man in any of our wealthy families these predictions may reasonably be written: He will marry, not too young, a woman of approximately equal rank in life, of healthy body and intelligent mind and some personal beauty. She will bear him children, and the children will be, in the main, sensibly and healthily reared, and they in turn will marry, and thus the family name will be perpetuated and the family possessions held together. It is not probable that any woman marries into a wealthy family without understanding what is expected of her. Parentage is as much a part of matrimony and matrimony as much a matter of course with those born to the gold as with those born to the purple. It is as unlikely that the house of Astor will want an heir as that the throne of England will want a sovereign.

Children as heirs and matrimony for their acquirement are sought even by those whose wealth is not counted by millions. In the aggregate they form a considerable proportion of the people of the United States; they include the leaders of fashion everywhere. We hear that babies are coming to be considered properer pets than pugs. In the richest and the most fashionable society, as well as in the best, this has always been true.

Nor is the member of the great middle class, as to wealth, which includes nine-tenths of our people, likely to be debarred from marriage by inability to meet the financial burdens of that estate. Wages and salaries constantly rise for all classes of service. The prices for the necessaries of life as constantly fall. There was never a time when the bare indispensables of life could be procured with so little labor, or when so large a proportion of the

fruits of toil took the shape of luxuries or semi-necessities, as books, pictures, decorations, vacation trips, and the thousand-and-one things which make life more than mere existence. Rent alone remains obstinately high. The proper solution of the rapid-transit problem would, in New York at least, increase the chances of matrimony, morality, and happiness to the average mortal more than ten thousand Cassandras crying evil could decrease them.

The young man who finds himself so wedded to fine clothing, champagne, or water-colors that he cannot afford a wife and children may be pitied, not because he is poor, but because he is foolish. The carpenter or day-laborer in New England two hundred and thirty years ago, earning two or three shillings a day in wages and paying five and sixpence for a bushel of corn, would have made no such selfish and self-cheating choice.

But it is not always because men are selfish that they do not offer themselves in marriage. Many a man is known as a "gay bachelor," whose life, if the truth could be told, is one unwearying struggle to support parents or relatives, and who puts from him the longing for wife and home because he must. Such men, though remaining unmarried, are not likely to lower the ideal of wedded bliss. They are as heroic as those of the other sex whose like renunciation has been the theme of so many edifying tales.

Culture and æsthetic advance, looked upon suspiciously as enemies, promise to be allies of marriage. It is the kernel of æsthetic wisdom to separate the beauty idea from the expense idea. No one need now be ashamed of admiring, possessing, or enjoying something which is cheap and pretty. One apostle of the æsthetic cult tells of furnishing and decorating a room for ten dollars. "Form," says this lawgiver, "costs, and texture costs, but color is cheap. Anybody can have color." The artistic fraternity, rapidly increasing in influence, helps to restore the self-respect of the man with a shallow pocket. There are few studios whose occupants, all professors of the art of beauty, do not without shame avow and exhibit expedients by which they have achieved captivating results in decoration at a minimum of expense. These men and women handle colors, masses, effects. They do not count the threads of their fabrics or turn magnifying glasses upon their rents and patches. Our people—the people upon whom the prophets of evil most base their doleful predictions—have never been farther from hopeless mammon-worship than they are now.

There is one element in human nature and the constitution of society more important than any other consideration or considerations to the future of marriage. That is the noble sentiment of love, too much ignored, ever dominant in the human race, ingrained in the very being of men and women, native to their growth. It will not be educated out of us. It shapes itself to our peculiarities. It is generous in the generous, refined in the refined, strong in the weak, but strongest in the strong. What improves the man improves the lover. What makes the man more fit for life makes him more fit for love. So long as grass grows green and water runs downward to the sea, will men and women share their joys and sorrows, cherish their offspring, and build in happy hope the fabric of their homes. Monasticism, profligacy, extravagance, every force of wrong or pervert right which has run counter to the course of this basic element of human nature, have been worsted in the encounter. The rosy lips of Cupid utter an "everlasting no" to the cry that marriage is a failure. The form of it may change, non-essentials be added or subtracted, but the substance will endure.

JOHN L. HEATON.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXVII.

AUGUST, 1891.

NEW LIGHT ON THE JEWISH QUESTION.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D.C.L.

THE rising of the native populations of northern and eastern Europe against the Jews continues to increase in extent and in horror. From Germany, Russia, Austria, and the Danubian principalities it has spread to the Ionian Islands. In Russia, where the government takes the lead, the movement has assumed a form which calls forth general cries of indignation and pity. There are symptoms of a sympathetic movement even in France. The anti-Semitic revolt is, in fact, one of the great features of the age. Yet most of those who talk and write about it seem to mistake its nature and its cause.

The general belief has been that the anti-Semitic movement is religious, and that the Jews are being persecuted, as they were, or are assumed to have been, in the middle ages, on account of their faith. Such was the tenor of all the manifestoes, speeches, and editorials in which British indignation against Russia found vent after the anti-Semitic disturbances of 1880. Everybody said that the dark ages had come again, and that the murderous atrocities of mediæval fanaticism were being reënacted in the nineteenth century.

Now, persecution is not the tendency of the Russian or of the church to which he belongs. The Eastern Church, while it has

NOTE.—A reply to this article, from the Hebrew point of view, will appear in a future number of THE REVIEW.—EDITOR NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

been superstitious and torpid, has always been tolerant, and, compared with other orthodox churches, free from the stain of persecution. It has not even been proselytizing, nor has it ever sent forth crusaders. Stanley, in his "Eastern Church" (p. 34), dilates upon this characteristic of the Eastern Christians. He says that "a respectful reverence for every manifestation of religious feeling has withheld them from violent attacks on the rights of conscience and led them to extend a kindly patronage to forms of faith most removed from their own"; and he notices that the great philosophers of antiquity are honored by portraits in their churches as heralds of the gospel. Mackenzie Wallace, who is the best authority, while he admits the inferiority of the Russian priests in learning, testifies strongly to their innocence of persecution, saying that "they have neither that haughty intolerance which characterizes their Roman Catholic brethren nor that narrow-minded, bitter, uncharitable sectarian spirit which is too often to be found among Protestants," and that "they allow not only to heretics, but also to members of their own communion, the most complete intellectual freedom, and never think of anathematizing any one for his scientific or unscientific opinions." The educated classes he represents as generally indifferent to theological questions. The peasantry are superstitious and blindly attached to their own faith, which they identify with their nationality; but they think it perfectly natural and right that a man of a different nationality should have a different religion. In the great fair of Nizni-Novgorod the Mohammedan mosque and the Armenian church stand side by side with the orthodox cathedral. At one end of a village is the church, at the other the mosque, and the Mohammedan spreads his prayer-carpet on the deck of a steamer full of orthodox Russians. The Czar is practically, though not theoretically, head of the church as well as of the state; he is the chief of Holy Russia, and in the interest rather of national unity than of religious orthodoxy he restrains proselytism. Nicholas was the most rigorous of Czars, and the most bent on the enforcement of uniformity. Yet Mackenzie Wallace tells a pleasant story of his commending the Jewish sentinel who had conscientiously refused to return the Czar's Easter salutation.

Assuredly the Russian government has never been guilty of anything like the persecutions of Philip II., Ferdinand of Aus-

tria, or Louis XIV. That the Jews have had liberty of worship and education, the existence of 6,319 synagogues and of 77 Jewish schools supported by the state, besides 1,165 private and communal schools, seems clearly to prove.* A Roman cardinal, before he flings his stone at the Russian Church for persecuting the Jews, should think of the records of his own church and look into the Encyclical which he holds in his hand.

After the last anti-Semitic disturbances in Russia, and when the vials of British wrath had been fully poured forth upon the Czar and his people, the British consuls at the different places in Russia at which disturbances had taken place were directed to report on them to the government. Their reports are comprised in two blue books (1881), into which few probably took the trouble to look at the time, but which every one who undertakes to deal with this question and pass judgment on the conduct of the Russian Government and people ought to make a point of reading.

From the consuls we learn, in the first place, that, though the riots were deplorable and criminal, the Jewish accounts published in the London *Times* were in most cases exaggerated, and in some to an extravagant extent. The damage to Jewish property at Odessa, rated in the Jewish account at 1,137,381 rubles, or, according to their higher estimates, 3,000,000 rubles, was rated, Consul-General Stanley tells us, by a respectable Jew on the spot at 50,000 rubles, while the consul-general himself rates it at 20,000. At Elizabethgrad, instead of whole streets being razed to the ground, only one hut had been unroofed. Few Jews, if any, had been intentionally killed, though some died of injuries received in the riots. The outrages on women, of which, according to the Jewish accounts, there had been a frightful number—no less than thirty in one place and twenty-five in another—and by which public indignation in England had been most fiercely aroused, seem, after inquiries by the consuls, to have been reduced to something like half a dozen authenticated cases in all. This is the more remarkable because the riots commonly began with the sacking of the *vodka* shops, which are kept by the Jews, so that the passions of the mob must have been inflamed by drink. The horrible charge brought by the Jews in *The Times* against the Russian women, of having incited the men to outrage their Jewish sisters and held the Jewesses down, to punish them for their

* "Statesman's Year-Book," 1891, pp. 854-856.

superior finery in dress, is found to be utterly baseless. The charge of roasting children alive also falls to the ground. The Jewish pamphlet reprinted from the London *Times* states that a Jewish innkeeper was cooped in one of his own barrels and cast into the Dnieper. This turns out to be a fable, the village which was the alleged scene of it being ten miles from the Dnieper and near no other river of consequence. The Russian peasant is entitled to justice. As a rule, though ignorant and often, thanks to the Jewish vodka shop, intemperate, he is good-natured. There was much brutality, but not the fiendish atrocity which marks the risings of the populace of Paris. For the belief that the mob was "doing the will of the Czar"—in other words, that the government was at bottom of the rising—there does not appear to have been a shadow of foundation. The action of the authorities was not in all cases equally prompt. At Warsaw the commandant held back, though as Lord Granville, the British ambassador, bears witness, his motive for hesitation was humanity. But numbers of rioters were shot down or bayoneted by the troops, hundreds were flogged, some were imprisoned, and some were sent to Siberia. It was not likely that the Russian Government would encourage insurrection. People of the upper class, fancying that in the agitation was the work of Socialists, would be sure not to sympathize with the rioters. Efforts were made by the government to restore Jewish property, and handsome sums were subscribed for the relief of the sufferers.

A lesson of caution is read us when we see charges so foul as that against the Russian women published in the London *Times* reproduced in an authorized pamphlet and generally accepted. The darkness in which Russia is shrouded exposes her to calumny, against which her government takes little care to defend itself. She is unpopular on account of her despotism, which hitherto she has not been able to help, and for which even now no substitute is proposed by anybody except the Nihilists, who propose a chaos out of which a sterner despotism would spring. She has been hated in England since the Crimean War, which was brought on, not by her, though the Czar behaved unwisely, but by the machinations of Louis Napoleon and Palmerston. Even with regard to her prisons and prison system, for which, as well as for her treatment of the Jews, she is now arraigned, let those who wish to do justice compare with the thrilling narratives of the platform the

work of Mr. Lansdell, an apparently honest and sober writer, who, after thorough inspection on the spot, depicts the Russian prison system as simply like other things in Russia, below the level of advanced civilization, while he vastly reduces the number and sufferings of political exiles. Of these exiles, many, it must be remembered, are members of a murder-club which assassinated the emancipator of the serfs. When the quarrel is Jewish, more than usual caution is required, since the press of Europe is to a great and increasing extent in the hands of Jews.

The most important part of the evidence given in the consuls' reports, however, is that which relates to the cause of the troubles. At Warsaw, where the people are Roman Catholics, there appears to have been a certain amount of passive sympathy with the insurgents on religious grounds. But everywhere else the concurrent testimony of the consuls is that the source of the agitation was economical and social, not religious. Bitterness produced by the exactions of the Jew, envy of his wealth, jealousy of his ascendency, combined in the lowest of the mob with the love of plunder, were the motives of the people for attacking him, not hatred of his faith. Vice-Consul Wagstaff, who seems to have paid particular attention to the question and made the most careful inquiry, after paying a tribute to the sober, laborious thrifty character and the superior intelligence of the Jew, and ascribing to these his increasing monopoly of commerce, proceeds :

"It is chiefly as brokers or middle-men that the Jews are so prominent. Seldom a business transaction of any kind takes place without their intervention, and from both sides they receive compensation. To enumerate some of their other occupations, constantly denounced by the public: they are the principal dealers in spirits ; keepers of 'vodka' (drinking) shops and houses of ill-fame ; receivers of stolen goods ; illegal pawnbrokers and usurers. A branch they also succeed in is as government contractors. With their knowledge of handling money, they collude with unscrupulous officials in defrauding the state to vast amounts annually. In fact, the malpractices of some of the Jewish community have a bad influence on those whom they come in contact with. It must, however, be said that there are many well-educated, highly-respectable, and honorable Jews in Russia, but they form a small minority. This class is not treated upon in this paper. They thoroughly condemn the occupations of their lower brethren, and one of the results of the late disturbances is noticed in the movement at present amongst the Jews. They themselves acknowledge the abuses practised by some of their own members, and suggest remedial measures to allay the irritation existing among the working classes.

"Another thing the Jews are accused of is that there exists among them a system of boycotting ; they use their religion for business purposes. This

is expressed by the words 'koul,' or 'kagal,' and 'kherim.' For instance, in Bessarabia, the produce of a vineyard is drawn for by lot, and falls, say, to Jacob Levy; the other Jews of the district cannot compete with Levy, who buys the wine at his own price. In the leasing by auction of government and provincial lands, it is invariably a Jew who outbids the others and afterwards relets plots to the peasantry at exorbitant prices. Very crying abuses of farming out land have lately come to light and greatly shocked public opinion. Again, where estates are farmed by Jews, it is distressing to see the pitiable condition in which they are handed over on the expiration of the lease. Experience also shows they are very bad colonists.

"Their fame as usurers is well known. Given a Jewish recruit with a few rubles' capital, it can be worked out, mathematically, what time it will take him to become the money-lender of his company or regiment, from the drummer to the colonel. Take the case of a peasant: if he once gets into the hands of this class, he is irretrievably lost. The proprietor, in his turn, from a small loan gradually mortgages and eventually loses his estate. A great deal of landed property in south Russia has of late years passed into the hands of the Israelites, but principally into the hands of intelligent and sober peasants.

"From first to last, the Jew has his hand in everything. He advances the seed for sowing, which is generally returned in kind—quarters for bushels. As harvest time comes round, money is required to gather in the crops. This is sometimes advanced on hard conditions; but the peasant has no choice; there is no one to lend him money, and it is better to secure something than to lose all. Very often the Jew buys the whole crop as it stands in the field on his own terms. It is thus seen that they themselves do not raise agricultural products, but they reap the benefits of others' labor, and steadily become rich, while proprietors are gradually getting ruined. In their relation to Russia they are compared to parasites that have settled on a plant not vigorous enough to throw them off, and which is being gradually sapped of its vitality."

The peasants, the vice-consul tells us, often say, when they look at the property of a Jew, "That is my blood." In confirmation of his view he cites the list of demands formulated by the peasants and laid before a mixed committee of inquiry into the causes of the disorder. These demands are all economical or social, with the exception of the complaint that Russian girls in Jewish service forget their religion and with it lose their morals. Everything, in short, seems to bear out the statement of the Russian Minister of the Interior, in a manifesto given in the blue book, that "the movement had its main cause in circumstances purely economical," provided that to "economical" we add "social," and include all that is meant by the phrase "hatred of Jewish usurpation" used in another document.

Vice-Consul Harford, at Sebastopol, is in contact with the Jews of the Crimea, who, he says, are of a superior order, while

some of them are not Talmudic Jews, but belong to the mild sect of the Karaites. He says that in his quarter all goes well.

"The spirit of antagonism that animates the Russian against the Jew is, in my opinion, in no way to be traced to the difference of creed. In this part of Russia, where we have more denominations of religion than in any other part, I have never, during a residence of fourteen years, observed the slightest indication of sectarianism in any class. The peasant, though ignorant and superstitious, is so entirely free from bigotry that even the openly-displayed contempt of the fanatical Mohammedan Crim Tartar for the rights and ceremonies of the Russian Church fails to excite in him the slightest feeling of personal animosity; his own feeling with regard to other religions is perfect indifference; he enters a mosque or synagogue just as he would enter a theatre, and regards the ceremony in much the same manner that an English peasant would, neither knowing nor caring to know whether they worshipped God or the moon. As it is evident from this that race and creed are to the minds of the peasantry of no more consequence than they would be to a Zulu, the only conclusion is that the antipathy is against the usurer, and as civilization can only be expected to influence the rising generation of Russian peasantry, the remedy rests with the Jew, who, if he will not refrain from speculating (in lawless parts of the empire) on ignorance and drunkenness, must be prepared to defend himself and his property from the certain and natural result of such a policy."

In Germany, in Austria, in Rumania, in all the countries of Europe where this deplorable contest of races is going on, the cause of quarrel appears to be fundamentally the same. It appears to be economical and social, not religious, or religious only in a secondary degree. Mr. Baring-Gould tells us that in Germany "there is scarce a village without some Jews in it, who do not cultivate land themselves, but lie in wait like spiders for the failing Bauer." A German who knew the peasantry well said to Mr. Gould that "he doubted whether there were a happier set of people under the sun." But he added, after a pause, "so long as they are out of the clutch of the Jew." Of the German, as well as of the Russian, it may be said that he is not a religious persecutor. If persecution of a sanguinary or violent kind has ever sullied his annals, the arm of it was the house of Austria, with its Spanish connection, and the head was the world-roving Jesuit. In the case of Hungary, Mr. Paget, who is a Liberal and advocates a liberal policy towards the Jews, says: "The Jew is no less active in profiting by the vices and necessities of the peasant than by those of the noble. As sure as he gains a settlement in a village the peasantry become poor." "In Austrian Poland," says a *Times* reviewer, "the worst of the peasant's

sluggish content is that it has given him over to the exactions of the Jews." "The Jews," he adds, "are in fact the lords of the country." They are lords not less alien to the people than the Norman was to the Saxon, and perhaps not always more merciful, though in their hands is the writ of ejection instead of the conqueror's sword.

Light dawned on the writer's mind on this question when he had just been listening with sympathy to speeches in the British House of Commons on the anti-Semitic movement in Rumania, where, as in Russia, the number of Jews is particularly large and the feeling against them is proportionately intense. The Jewish member who appealed to the government on the subject, and the Foreign Secretary who responded to the appeal had both of them assumed that it was a case of religious persecution, and the Foreign Secretary especially dwelt on the mischievous influence of ecclesiastics; with how little justice, so far as the priests of the Eastern Church are concerned, we have already seen. The debate over, the writer was accosted by his friend the late Dr. Humphrey Sandwith, distinguished for his share in the defence of Kars against the Russians, who knew the Danubian principalities well. Dr. Sandwith said that the speakers had been entirely mistaken; that religion was not the motive of the agitation; that neither the people nor their priests were intolerant; that the government had given aid to a synagogue; but that Jewish usurers got the simple-minded peasants into their toils and sold them out of their homesteads till the peasants would bear it no longer, and an outbreak ensued. Dr. Sandwith, being a thorough-going Liberal, would have been the last man to palliate religious persecution.

In the middle ages intolerance reigned. Christian heretics were persecuted fully as much as Jews, and their case was the harder as they were not voluntary intruders, but natives. The Jew had shown in his persecution of Christianity that he was not less intolerant than the rest. Yet even in the middle ages perhaps the economical and social causes of popular hostility to the Jews had more influence in proportion to the religious cause than is commonly assumed. When the people rise, as at York, they make for the depositaries of the Jewish bonds. The Crusades carried popular fanaticism to its height, but the Jews had probably at the same time increased their social unpopularity by making usurious profits out of the needs of the Crusaders. It was,

moreover, suspected, not without some reason, that the hearts of the Hebrews were on the Oriental side. The clearest as well as the most horrible case of religious persecution was in Spain; though even in Spain it was a battle of races as much as of creeds, and the Jew suffered partly at least for being the kinsman and suspected ally of the Moor.

The explanation of the whole trouble, and of all the calamities and horrors attending it, past or to come, is that the Jews are, to adopt the phrase borrowed by Vice-Consul Wagstaff from natural history, a parasitic race. Detached from their own country, they insert themselves for the purpose of gain into the homes of other nations, while they retain a marked and repellent nationality of their own. They are not the only parasitic race, though they are incomparably the most important and formidable; the Armenians, the Greeks of the dispersion, ancient and modern, the Parsis, and even the humble Gypsies, being other instances, while the Lombards in the middle ages and the Italians generally when their country had fallen under foreign dominion showed something like the same tendency. There is, therefore, nothing miraculous or mysterious in their condition.

Whence their parasitism took its rise is a point on which we seem not to be clearly informed. We can only be sure that it had a natural origin. Certainly it was anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem, though it was fixed and perpetuated by that catastrophe. It may have begun with the transplantation to Babylon, and have been extended by the transplantation to Egypt under the Ptolemies. But its principal cause probably was the narrowness of the Jewish territory combined with the love of gain in the Jew. The Hebrew was the near kinsman of the Phœnician, who by the narrowness of his territory and his love of gain was likewise impelled to adventure, and Jewish parasitism is the counterpart, under another form, of that Phœnician colonization which, unlike the nobler colonization of the Greek, was strictly mercantile in its aim. Apparently, there was a religious party in Judea which wished to make the people simple and pious tillers of the soil, and from which emanated the ideal of that polity of husbandmen with hereditary lots and a year of jubilee ascribed by its framers to the great lawgiver of the race. But the trading instinct was too strong. In the stories of the patriarch who bought the birthright of his hungry brother

for a mess of pottage, of the Jewish vizier who taught Pharaoh how to obtain the surrender of all the freeholds of his people by taking advantage of the famine, and of the Hebrews who spoiled the Egyptians by pretending to borrow jewels which they meant never to return, we see the gleamings of a character which was not likely to be content with the moderate gains of a small farming community.

The bond of Judaism and the sustaining cause of Jewish isolation has been the Talmud, a vast collection of legalism, ceremonialism, and casuistry, destined by its minute observances to preserve the purity of the Jew and keep him apart from the impure Gentile. Without this, and the authority of the rabbins based on it, he would probably have in time become as other men and blended with the nations in which he sojourned. Circumcision, above all, the seal of tribalism, perpetuates his isolation. Jerusalem, though lost, and though even the desire of returning to it must have become very faint, acts like the Mohammedan's Caaba as a point for prayer, while the vague hope of a Messiah and of universal dominion helps to sustain the pride and exclusiveness of the tribe. The Mosaic Sabbath and the retention of the Hebrew as a sacred language have completed the barrier of separation. The supposed purity of the race is denied by Renan, who believes that in the earlier wanderings of the Hebrews among the nations of the ancient world mixed elements were taken up. M. Leroy-Beaulieu appears to be of the same opinion.

Jewish exclusiveness would be aggravated by Christian and feudal intolerance; but it is unjust to charge Christendom or feudalism with having impressed upon the Jew an unsocial character, which had already been painted by Roman satire, and had brought the Jew into collision with the communities of the ancient world. However high or rare the gifts of a race may be, if it goes among other races for the purpose of absorbing their wealth by its financial practices, at the same time maintaining its tribal isolation, treating the rest of the community as unclean, refusing to intermarry or to eat with them, and—what is more—dealing with them on the principles of a tribal morality, its unpopularity is a certain consequence. To hold the Jew wholly irresponsible for the evils of an unhappy relation, you must frame an indictment against human nature and mankind.

It is impossible that the expulsion of a multitude of people from the land which has long been their home should not be horrible and heartrending, even though we may suspend our belief as to the gratuitous and fiendish atrocities of which the Russian Government and people are accused. The soul of the civilized world may well be moved by the sight. But the war which we witness is one not of religions, but of races brought by the peculiar tendencies of one of them into relations out of which a conflict was sure sooner or later to arise. The Jew fights with intelligence, while the Russian or Rumanian fights with force; but this alone is not decisive in favor of the Jew.

The dislike of the Jew and the desire to be rid of him have received a strong impulse, as has been truly said, from that reviving spirit of nationalism which, dating from the rising of the nations against Napoleon, has been fostered by the school of history of which Augustin Thierry was a model, and is showing itself not only in Russia, Germany, Hungary, and Bohemia, but in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. The Jew is now detested not only because he absorbs the national wealth, but because, when present in numbers, he eats out the core of nationality. It is true that all nations are more or less composed of mixed races and have in them, perhaps, some even of the cave-dwellers' blood; but then the other elements amalgamate and the result is a nation, with which the tribal Jew does not blend. This is not the place for discussing the question between the nation and humanity; but the tribe, of which Judaism is a survival, is narrower, not broader, than the nation.

Our view of the Jewish question has been hitherto distorted by our theology. On the one hand, the Jew has been absurdly and cruelly held responsible for the death of Christ. On the other, we have accepted the belief that the Jews are a favored race, that the Father of all, like tribal gods, such as Zeus, Brahma, or Wodin, selected a particular tribe, made a covenant with it, and pledged himself, so long as it would serve him, to promote its interests against those of his other children; that for it he slew all the innocent first-born of Egypt, besides sending a series of horrible plagues upon the helpless subjects of Pharaoh; that he commissioned it to invade the country of people who had done it no wrong, and to put them and their wives and children to the sword; and that he stopped the sun in heaven to

enable it to slaughter its flying enemies. We have persisted in reading for edification the account of the slaying of Sisera, and that story of blood over which Jewish tribalism still fiercely exults in its great feast of Purim, including the hanging of Haman's ten sons at the instance of a vindictive Jewess. This we do in the face of the gospel declaration that God made all races of men of one blood to dwell together on the earth. Rational criticism is now happily setting us free and teaching us that the parts of the Old Testament fit for religious use are those which are spiritual and not tribal, such as the higher prophets and most of the Psalms. But we are still in the penumbra of superstition.

A preacher has been heard to say that "a Jew would judge the world." Jesus was a native of the province in which the population was most mixed, and from which, as Pharisaic tribalism thought, no good could come. He called himself the son of man. To Talmudic Judaism his religion, of which the soul is the spontaneity of conscience, forms the most perfect contrast, while it develops and exalts the spiritualism of the prophets and the later school of Hillel. To Talmudic Judaism Christianity has no affinity and owes no debt whatever. The contrast is scarcely less strong between Talmudic Judaism and the philosophic Judaism of the Alexandrian Philo.

In western Europe and in the United States the Jews are comparatively few and scattered; the assimilating forces of an active-minded and highly-educated society are strong; and the integument of Talmudic ice, exposed at once to the rays of an intellectual civilization and to the warm breath of religious equality, has to a great extent given way. The Hebrew has been in part, as his sympathizing friend M. Leroy-Beaulieu tells him he will have to be, "derabbinized and denationalized." Derabbinized he has been so far that the other day some Jews recognized the beneficent character and teaching of Christ, which is certainly a wide departure from the sentiments of the *Toldoth Jesu*. His religion, where he is most derabbinized, appears to be simply theism, with more or less of a lingering conviction that some special mission is reserved by Providence for his race. But it differs from Christian theism. The God of the Jews is one who rewards or punishes, blesses or curses, in this life: worldly prosperity is the sign of his favor; worldly adversity of his wrath. The

Jew pursues present good. As Spinoza says, *Sapientia ejus in vitâ, non in morte est.* He has always been utterly averse from asceticism, the underlying idea of which is the sacrifice of present to future happiness. Self-mortification, like that of a Roman Catholic saint, has, of course, been entirely repugnant to him ; but he also practically rejects the belief common to Christians that the present world is evil and that we must look for our real happiness in another. Such, at least, we gather to be the frame of mind of the more liberal Jew, who in this respect falls in with the practical creed of the agnostic. He seems also on the point of relinquishing his separate Sabbath. He eats and drinks with his Gentile fellow-citizens, nor does he refuse intermarriage with them, though it still seems to go somewhat against the grain, and the marriage of a great Jewish heiress with an English nobleman was understood to be an event far from welcome to the financiers of her tribe. If some of the precepts of the Talmud are still observed by the liberal Jew, it is on sanitary rather than on religious grounds. Among the intellectual Jews of the West there appear to be non-sectarian divisions which, as the isolation of Israel depends on its unity, may be the heralds of social amalgamation.

The derabbinization is far advanced, but the denationalization will not be complete, or anything like complete, till the Jew gives up the tribal rite of circumcision, which must always carry with it tribal sentiment and a feeling of separation from the rest of mankind. The intense love of gain and the addiction to the money trade are ingrained, and it is probable that many generations will pass before the balance of the Hebrew intellect and character is restored by a community of pursuits with other men. Whether any of the tribal morality, the presence of which in the Talmud cannot be denied, still lingers in the mercantile dealings of the Jew, those who are brought into commercial relations with him must decide. He is—indeed, he has always and everywhere been—a conforming citizen, and has refused none of the burdens of the state, though he has made them as light as he could. He adopts also the language of the country in which he lives, reserving that of Judea for the interior of the synagogue. But he changes his country more easily than others. When the Southern Confederacy fell, its leaders generally stood by the wreck and did their best for those whom they had led ; but Judah Benjamin went off to pastures new.

It is also with a certain air of exploitation, the attitude of the cosmopolitan trader, that the genuine Jew takes up any political cause or party. It is impossible that a man should be heartily loyal to two nationalities at once; and so long as a trace of Jewish nationality remains the Jew cannot be a thorough Englishman or American. In fact, when a Jewish question arises in any part of the world, we are made to feel that there is a Jewish interest apart from that of the several nations in which the Jews have their abode. England was made to feel this in her disputes with Russia, and France was made to feel it in the Tunisian expedition. Light, however, would be thrown on this part of the matter if some Jewish authority would tell us distinctly what relation Jewish nationality or the tie of Jewish race bears to the nationality of the country in which the Jew happens to dwell.

The Jew of America and western Europe has not much reason to complain of his present position. In a society of which wealth is the ruling power, his financial skill, sharpened by immemorial practice and aided by the confederacy of his kinsmen, makes him the master of wealth. In Europe patrician pride bows its head before him, and royalty itself is at his feet. The press is rapidly falling under his influence, and becoming the organ of his interests and his enmities. If any hearts still rebel against an ascendency of the stock exchange and a worship of material success in its least beneficent form, they are so few that they need not be taken into account. Here, in the West, we have no cruel and desperate problem before us. We must allow existing influences to work on, taking care, perhaps, to guard ourselves against commercial combinations, and to look now and then behind the curtain of the press.

It is in eastern Europe and in Russia, where the Jews are massed and where they are still thoroughly Talmudic, that the trouble arises, and the end of it does not seem near. If the quarrel were religious, the preaching of religious toleration might allay it; but we have seen that it is not religious, but economic, social, and national. What the peasant wants is not that Jews should be forcibly converted or that they should be prevented from worshipping in their own synagogues after their own fashion, but that he shall be freed from alien usury and domination. He would hardly desire anything so cruel as the expulsion of the Jews from the land which has long been their home, if it were possi-

ble that their habits and bearing should be changed. But it is not likely that the yoke of the Jew will become less galling, or that the sufferance of the people will increase. Nor are the dense swarms of Russian or Rumanian Jews likely soon to be "derabbinized and denationalized," or to give up their immemorial trades. What will be the result in eastern Europe generally depends on a balance of forces which we have no means of correctly estimating. The governments generally are on the side of the Jew. To repress rioting and maintain order is their duty; while, in the financial state to which they have reduced themselves by their rivalry in military expenditure, they cannot afford to provoke the ire of the money power. The balance of policy inclines the same way. Nihilism is supposed to be partly recruited from the Jews, and their influx into London has been followed, it seems, by a strange development of the low socialistic press; but the notion that the disciples of the Talmud had anything to do with the French Revolution is too absurd for discussion: the party of the prosperous Jew is the party of wealth, and as a rule he is conservative. The Russian Government alone, being intensely national and very uncommercial, takes decidedly the part of its own people. The thanks of all nations will be due to Baron Hirsch, or any other philanthropist, who can find the solution of a problem which now for two thousand years has formed not the least calamitous and piteous part of the annals of humanity.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

THE VALUE OF NAVAL MANŒUVRES.

BY THE HON. JAMES R. SOLEY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

THE real purpose of a navy is to provide the state that maintains it with a certain necessary element of military strength. Its value as a part of governmental machinery must be finally measured by its fighting efficiency. If it has this quality, it answers the primary condition of its existence. If it has it not, it is not worth the expense of keeping up. The necessity of maintaining a force in any given state depends somewhat upon the ability of the state to avoid international disputes. But no state with vulnerable points,—namely, a commercial marine, an extensive coast line, and populous seaport cities,—can afford to be without a war navy, unless, by some method hitherto unknown to international politics, it can secure an immunity from controversy. The only substitute for such a method lies in the maintenance of a force efficient enough to make an assault upon its rights an expensive and serious business.

As fighting efficiency is the real test of the value of a navy, the most important occupation of its officers in peace is to prepare the force for those occasional but momentous crises in which it is called upon to perform its part in the national defence. In the old days of sailing-vessels this business of training was comparatively easy. The manœuvring of a ship under sail, the control and direction of a ship's company, the firing of a broadside so as to hit the mark, and, finally, the management of a squadron in accordance with certain simple tactical rules, comprised the whole mystery of the profession. In the complete preparation of officers and men for the crises of battle, the only additional requirements were the practice of the virtues of courage, obedience, and tenacity. Even ordinary sea-training was often wanting. In the time of Blake and Prince Rupert the

English fleets were commanded and fought by soldiers rather than sailors, and it was only at the end of the seventeenth century that officers of the school of Benbow, with accomplishments distinctly nautical, resumed their place in the front ranks of the service. Down to the early part of the present century the sum total of necessary professional knowledge was exceedingly slight and simple.

Since the year 1840 the character of the naval profession in this respect has completely changed. Not only has the introduction of steam as a motive power made the ship an immense piece of complicated machinery, but a great variety of contrivances, in the shape of new weapons, means of defence, torpedo outfits, appliances for lighting, for steering and manœuvring, for signals, for pointing and firing guns, and for other purposes, have called into play nearly every branch of physical and mechanical science, and made a knowledge of these branches a necessity. The marine engine, the ram, the rifled gun, the machine gun, the dynamo, the higher explosives, armor, and torpedoes have increased enormously the variety and complexity of naval operations. Commerce-destroying in fast steamers has been reduced to a science. Blockades, which in the old days any fairly good seaman was competent to maintain, have now become a difficult and intricate problem. Operations on rivers and inland waters, which formed so large a part of the work of the navy during the Civil War, present questions of exceptional interest and difficulty. The science of torpedo attack and defence under all the various circumstances which lend themselves to the use of this novel weapon has opened out a new art of war, whose ultimate developments no man can foresee or calculate. The success which has attended the employment of sailors as land troops upon certain occasions demonstrates that a navy must now have an organization elastic enough to meet the demands of this branch of service. Ascending from these special questions into the higher field of grand tactics or strategy, the properly-trained officer must know intimately the offensive and defensive capacity of vessels, not, as formerly, of half a dozen well-defined types, but of every variety of armament and structure; he must evolve methods of operating against and of protecting a coast; he must ascertain the proper distribution of naval resources; he must consider the question of the provision of a coal supply; the value of speed as a factor in warfare in gen-

eral, as well as in the force of any given ship; the best points for attack or defence,—all of them questions involving close study and observation, as well as experience.

While the navy is always presumably occupied in preparation for war, its activity may be exerted in two distinct directions. The incessant international competition in the development of naval material makes it necessary for the organization to devote its energies quite as much to keeping the instruments of war in an advanced stage of progress as to being able to use the materials to advantage when they have been obtained. The naval officer has, therefore, two objects before him: he must perform his part in contributing to the mechanical progress of the navy, and he must be able to fight when the occasion comes. Until within a period comparatively recent, the tendency has been to turn most in the first of these directions, because it represented the matter in hand, the thing obviously to be done, promising immediate results in a conspicuous form. The result has shown itself in the enormous strides made since the beginning of naval reconstruction, in 1882. Now, however, when the new ships are becoming available for service, the time has come to train the navy in using them as fighting weapons. Without such a system of special training the government might find itself in the position of having a first-class fleet which was almost useless through a failure to educate officers in the conditions of actual war. They would know the workshop, but not the field of battle. Nor would the customary alternations of shore and sea service remove the difficulty. Officers whose experience was thus limited might become experts in ordinary cruising, but ordinary cruising is not war, nor will it take the place of the training which modern war requires.

Fighting capacity is largely a matter of aptitude; and in the acquisition of it, as of any other aptitude involving moral and physical qualities, individuals differ greatly. Some men acquire a knack by intuition; they become riders as soon as they jump into the saddle, as they become good shots or expert anglers the moment a gun or a rod is placed in their hands. Others accomplish the same results only after long and troublesome effort. Such men may attain facility through experience; and when men are endowed with a fair amount of nervous energy, experience that is sufficiently varied and continuous can almost be made to take the place of an instinct. The most effectual way of giving

this experience to a naval force is in actual war. It makes the difference between the veteran and the raw recruit. But as we cannot have a war in every decade for the sake of gaining experience, some substitute must be provided which shall contribute as far as possible to making veterans of our officers and men.

To accomplish this requires a double process. In the first place, the officer must familiarize himself with the details of modern naval operations. Until lately not much attention has been given to this subject. In fact, it is only within a short time that naval strategy as a distinct science has been made the subject of systematic study. The experience of our navy in the Civil War was of the most comprehensive, long-continued, and varied character, and was the first in which operations had been conducted on a great scale since the revolution in naval science. Other naval wars, not so extensive, but equally instructive, from the fact that they made use of more modern apparatus, have taken place since then; and the publications of the Office of Naval Intelligence and the lectures of the Naval War College, both of which were begun at a moment when naval reconstruction had just made a fresh start, mark a new stage in the development of this branch of naval training.

The second, and by far the most important, essential in the preparation of naval officers for war is practice with the tools of their profession—and, be it remembered, these must be modern tools or the practice is useless—in operations carried on as nearly as may be under the conditions of actual war. Of course practice of this kind has its limitations. It is not possible, for instance, in a sham fight to be firing shot and shell; and therefore the killing and wounding which form such an essential feature of actual war are eliminated. Learning to stand fire is a lesson that cannot be taught in perfection by anything short of a *bonâ-fide* battle. Discipline and the cultivation of a high *morale* will help to secure it, and in a general way sham engagements may contribute to the same end, by familiarizing officers and men with the conditions under which the dangers of combat will be faced; but this is not their main purpose. Nor will they serve the purpose of a gunnery test, for the obvious reason that you cannot use one-half of your own ships and people as a target for the other half. This practice must be obtained by other methods, which, however, are sufficiently easy of application. In the use of torpedoes,

again, the sham fight has a restricted scope, although it is possible to measure results with a fair degree of accuracy by artificial tests without actually blowing up an occasional ironclad; and much the same may be said in regard to the ram.

These limitations, however, are all that distinguish the process of mimic war from real war; and essential as the difference may be in its effect on the feelings of the participants, it cannot destroy the value of the first as a practical training for the second. In the first place, the whole organization is put to the test of conducting an actual campaign. The mere matter of mobilization, which in former times was comparatively simple and unimportant, has come to be of extreme difficulty, and at the same time of enormous consequence, when the first three weeks may determine the issue of a war. To see the condition of a navy which has been ten or a dozen years at peace, and during that time has had no practice in rapid mobilization, we have only to look at our experience in 1861, when it took us eight months to gain a mere foothold upon four thousand miles of unprotected coast belonging to an enemy absolutely destitute of maritime resources.

When the squadrons are once mobilized, and the practice manœuvres reach the stage of a campaign with two hostile forces arrayed against each other and engaged in working out a specific problem of war under given conditions, there is hardly any point in the whole range of naval operations that will not receive attention and observation. Each of these makes demands upon officers and men identical with those of actual war, barring always the presence of danger, and calls for the same alertness of judgment, the same untiring energy, the same ready resource, the same quickness of eye and clearness of intelligence.

The value of sham battles, or war manœuvres, as they may be more properly called, is well understood by the most progressive maritime states, and in the navies of these states they have become a regular feature of the yearly administrative programme. The operations conducted in this way by the English, French, Italian, and German governments during the last few years are full of interest and instruction, and illustrate perfectly the advantages and the limitations of this sort of practice. To see exactly how the work is done it may be well to look at some of these a little in detail, and especially at those of the British in recent summers, which were carefully planned with a view

to elucidating the problems of naval strategy likely to arise when Great Britain is at war.

In the manœuvres of 1887 several successive operations were arranged, the principal scene of which was in the Channel. In the prescribed conditions it was supposed that an ironclad squadron of defence, commanded by Sir William Hewett, had lost touch of an enemy's squadron, under Rear-Admiral Fremantle, of nearly equal force, which was seeking to make a descent upon some point along the Channel coast, but at the same time to avoid an engagement with the defenders. The two squadrons consisted each of five battle-ships, with two fast cruisers as scouts. Under the rules governing the contest, ten hours of uninterrupted possession of the entrance to a seaport were held to be equivalent to an occupation.

Admiral Hewett's business was to prevent the enemy's threatened occupation. He could not tell where the blow would be struck, and his force was accordingly arranged between Portland and Cape La Hague, stretching out to the westward. This left unprotected the important town of Falmouth, but as it was only about 100 miles west of the line of defence, and as extensive arrangements had been made for telegraphing, it seemed fairly well covered. Nevertheless, the enemy's squadron, under Admiral Fremantle, steered directly for Falmouth and succeeded in maintaining its position there for ten hours of daylight. Its scout vessel, the "Archer," was sent to the eastward, skilfully disguised, and kept up communication with the squadron through an intermediate scout. Admiral Hewett learned that Fremantle was approaching Falmouth, but the information, though telegraphed from the Lizard, was nearly five hours in reaching him, and it was then so uncertain that he waited four hours more for further news. By the time he was well under way for Falmouth, Fremantle had departed, and the latter's scouts, still disguised, watched the squadron of defence on its way to the westward.

Fremantle now had the coast clear and passed up the Channel. When Hewitt discovered that the enemy had given him the slip, he retraced his course with all speed. He could not discover the exact position of the assailants, but he knew that they had several hours' start, and the campaign now became an exciting pursuit up the Channel. In this operation three of the pursuers broke

down. Admiral Fremantle was therefore still well in advance. At night he was going through the narrowest part of the Channel. This point was defended by a flotilla, composed of an armored coast-defence ship and several gunboats and torpedo-boats. In a real war he would probably have destroyed the flotilla, but it would have involved a delay of two hours or more. Disposing of these antagonists in a rather abridged engagement, he moved on to the northward and came to anchor at the mouth of the Thames. Only two of the requisite ten hours had elapsed when the squadron of Admiral Hewett came up with him. Fremantle then stood to the northward to pass out into the North Sea through the East Swin Channel. Hewett, still in pursuit, steamed through a parallel channel called the Black Deep, which was separated from the Swin by a shoal, and which was too narrow to permit ships to turn. Taking advantage of this fact, and of the state of the tide, Admiral Fremantle conceived the brilliant idea of turning himself up the Thames, crossing the shoals as the tide was ebbing, and leaving his pursuers to continue on their way to the end of the Black Deep, where their pursuit was further delayed by the fall of the tide. It was finally decided by the umpires that the attacking squadron was captured in the Thames. But there is no doubt that in actual war it would have had a good chance of escape, and it had already inflicted irreparable injury upon the enemy.

This series of manœuvres, which occupied ten battle-ships, with a number of subsidiary craft, for four days, was full of important lessons, not only for the general direction of the Admiralty, but for every officer and man of the squadrons. It threw new light on the problem to be solved in the defence of the English coast. It indicated precisely where the arrangements for securing information were defective—a point of the highest importance where the game was not so much one of heavy blows as of making successful efforts to elude. It showed the necessity of lightly-armed and swift vessels to serve as scouts or outposts for the main body, and that the possession of two such scouts would not answer the purpose. At the outset each commander exercised his ingenuity in deceiving the other, and each endeavored, according to his lights, to ascertain his opponent's plans. Admiral Hewett left Falmouth uncovered, fearing that the enemy

might pass Cape La Hague without his knowledge ; in which case all the approach to the eastward would have been unprotected. The enemy took advantage of this, and so got possession of Falmouth. A little more promptness in the service of information would perhaps have shortened his stay there. The practice gained by the lookout vessels was of immense value. The captains of such ships must rely largely upon their own judgment. No orders can be given that will exactly cover the situation in which they are placed. So, too, with all the other incidental features of the campaign. The trials of speed, the repair of breakdowns in machinery, the utilizing of makeshifts to accomplish a result with imperfect or damaged materials, the methods of approach of torpedo-boats, and the precautions necessary to keep them off—all these were sooner or later brought into play, and called for prompt decision and action from each commander and each ship's company.

The naval manœuvres of 1888 were conducted upon a much more extensive scale, and accomplished proportionately greater results. The plan of the Admiralty contemplated the rapid mobilization of a great naval force for a war of four weeks' duration upon the English coast. A great maritime power, christened for the occasion by the name of "Achill," whose geographical locus, for strategic purposes, is Ireland, is supposed to fit out two squadrons, which are lying in port in expectation of a war with England. Sir George Tryon, the Achill commander-in-chief, with five battle-ships, is at Berehaven, in Bantry Bay, on the south-western coast of Ireland, or Achill, and Admiral Fitz Roy, his second in command, with four, at Lough Swilly, on the northern coast. Each squadron has also five cruisers. Before these squadrons can complete their preparations war breaks out, and two powerful British squadrons—one under Vice-Admiral Baird, with seven battle-ships and seven cruisers ; the other under Rear-Admiral Rowley, with six battle-ships and six cruisers—blockade the Achill forces in their respective ports, both of which are supposed to be strongly fortified. Each side has, in addition, twelve torpedo-boats. War is declared by telegram July 24, and is announced to close August 20.

This being the condition of affairs at the outbreak of the war, the obvious plan of operation of the Achill squadrons was to break the blockade with a part of their forces, and, while the blockaders

were still occupied with the remainder, to start on a cruise of devastation against British commerce and seaports, of course excluding Ireland, which was Achill territory. In order that the escape of the Achill ships might not take place too early and thus defeat one of the main objects of the manœuvres, namely, to obtain practice in blockading, Tryon and Fitz Roy were privately instructed that no ship was to go out, in any case, before the 2d of August. The first ten days were therefore taken up in slight encounters by day and brisk attacks by the blockaded torpedo-boats at night, which gave the blockaders incessant harassing occupation, as they were ignorant of the fact that no attempt would be made to escape. The attacks were far from being mere feints; and in one of them the "Inconstant," of the blockading fleet, was torpedoed (in imagination). Certain of the torpedo-boats on one side or the other were also put out of action.

As soon as the prescribed time was up, the Achill commanders did not lose a moment in breaking away. On the night of the 3d, at Berehaven, simultaneous movements were made by nine of the blockaded ships in different parts of the harbor. The "Archer," of the British fleet, was guarding one of the entrances, and, while she was attacked by four torpedo-boats so smartly as to engross her attention, the enemy's ships "Warspite," "Iris," and "Severn" steamed along close to the high land at full speed and with all lights out, and so managed to pass the blockade unobserved. As soon as Baird learned that these three were at large, he apparently gave up all thought of maintaining any further blockade, or even of attempting a general defence of the coast. "Save London" was the one idea in his mind, and to this he bent all his energies. Orders were sent to Rowley to raise the blockade of Lough Swilly and join with his squadron at Luce Bay, off the Scottish coast, and thither Baird himself proceeded. The two squadrons met at midnight on the 5th. Rowley was obliged to report a similar failure in his blockade, for already on the night of the 2d, the first after the restriction had been removed, the Achill cruiser "Calypso" had stolen out of Lough Swilly unobserved, and on the 4th Fitz Roy himself, with the "Rodney," "Amphion," and "Spider," had followed—a fact which, as the official narrative tersely puts it, "the British admiral knew nothing of till the next morning."

The situation was now critical. Seven Achill vessels, two of them battle-ships, had escaped, and the British admiral had not the faintest clew to their projected movements. They would undoubtedly ravage the coast of Great Britain, and they had a start of from one to four days ; but where would they strike their first blow ? Unable to answer this question, Admiral Baird was confirmed in his decision that, as he could not protect all points, he would at least make that secure where there was most to lose, and set out for London, via the Channel. On the 6th he dropped Rowley's division off Holyhead, to watch Liverpool from that point, and proceeded alone ; but the next day, learning that Fitz Roy, with his two ironclads, had been sighted to the north of Scotland, he telegraphed Rowley to rejoin him. The latter complied, leaving two ironclads, the "Neptune" and "Belleisle," for the defence of Liverpool. This was on the 7th, but the two squadrons, delayed by fog and by the necessity of stopping for coal, did not unite in the Downs until the 12th.

Meantime the seven Achill vessels which had made their escape had entered upon an active career of suppositious devastation. The "Calypso," which had been the first to get out,—on the 2d of August,—started on an independent roving cruise. First she ran into Port Ellen, a telegraph station of Baird's squadron, where she captured one of his torpedo-boats and destroyed three steamers and the coal stores. Thence she hastened to Oban, where she remained during the night of the 3d, in which she requisitioned the town and captured a one-gun battery and several more steamers. For the next fortnight she cruised in the track of British commerce, and in that time captured 60,000 tons of shipping. Finally she put into Penzance, where she captured the coast-guard station.

Of the three vessels that left Lough Swilly on the 4th, the "Amphion" cruised undisturbed in the Channel, capturing much shipping. Another, the "Spider," devoted her attention to the west coast of Scotland, and in the course of three days carried the war to every accessible point in that neighborhood. At Campbelltown 5,000 tons of shipping were destroyed ; at Rothesay five steamers were sunk ; while at Greenock the shipping in the Clyde, amounting to 32,000 tons, was annihilated, and the public buildings on the quay were pulverized by the cruiser's fire. Thence she proceeded northward, inflicting like havoc wherever she went.

The third of the Lough Swilly fugitives, the battle-ship "Rodney," with Admiral Fitz Roy on board, met the three vessels from Berehaven, the "Warspite," "Iris," and "Severn," at a preconcerted rendezvous, two nights after their escape, and the new flying squadron, doubling the northern end of Scotland, pounced upon Aberdeen at daybreak of the 7th. A requisition of £400,000 was levied on the town and all the shipping was destroyed. Moving rapidly down the coast, Fitz Roy carried out a similar programme successively at Edinburgh (Leith), Shields, Newcastle, Hartlepool, Scarborough, and Grimsby. After bagging £5,000,000 in requisitions, levying extensive contributions of coal and provisions, and destroying immense quantities of unprotected shipping, Fitz Roy retraced his course, and on the 12th of August returned triumphantly to Lough Swilly without having met, since his escape eight days before, a single one of the thirty-six vessels of the squadron of defence, whether armor-clad, cruiser, or torpedo-boat.

Meanwhile, the blockade having been raised, the two Achill squadrons had effected a junction at Lough Swilly, and on the 8th Sir George Tryon sailed with five battle-ships to attack Liverpool. It will be remembered that only the "Neptune" and "Belleisle" had been left to defend this port, only second to London in importance. When Tryon's column came in sight, the "Neptune" was cruising off the bar, and wisely took to her heels. The unfortunate "Belleisle," however, was caught at anchor while taking on coal, and after a short conflict hauled down her colors. The town was then heavily requisitioned and the shipping destroyed. After "rummaging" the port of Holyhead, the Achill squadron returned to Lough Swilly, where it was joined, as already stated, on the 12th, by Admiral Fitz Roy's vessels.

The remainder of the war presented no striking incidents. The Achill squadron was compelled to use up four days in coaling, the great stumbling-block in all modern naval operations, and at the end of that time sailed for the Channel. Baird was still in the Downs, covering the mouth of the Thames, from which he dared not move. Some of the Achill vessels were engaged in commerce-destroying cruises, but the main force was moving unresisted up the Channel, when peace was declared on the 20th of August.

The manœuvres of 1888 had the effect of pointing out with great clearness certain elements of strategic weakness in the arrange-

ments for the national defence. The results accomplished by the Achillese, in their imaginary requisitions, captures, and conflagrations, were sufficiently alarming, even when stripped of all sensational exaggeration. No war ministry could survive the commercial panic that such a catalogue of disasters would produce. The manœuvres also served to discover several serious defects in organization and equipment, which had until then passed unnoticed. But their most important effect was to work into coherent unity, during four weeks of the most active service, whatever was heterogeneous in the organization of the fleet, and, by narrowing action down to a definite object, to give point and purpose to what would otherwise be a mere routine exercise. It is in this way as much as in any other that manœuvres are superior to ordinary drill.

Here was a force of officers and men, larger than the whole United States Navy, engaged in operations which, apart from the element of personal danger, were identical in all their minute details with those of real war. The disposition of the blockaded squadrons to ward off attack, and of the blockaders to prevent egress, was exactly the same that their commanders would have employed against a real enemy. They were the best that each could devise according to his judgment. The maintenance of communication between scouts and the main body of the fleet, the coaling of vessels at sea, the discovery of an enemy's plans and movements, the conveyance of information to ships and forts by signals, all the thousand-and-one minutiæ upon the proper observance of which by individuals so much depends in naval operations, were carried out with the same exacting precision that a war would call for. In torpedo attacks the assailants had to gauge their speed and judge their aim and distance, while the defenders needed all their quickness of eye and of hand to discover their opponents and bring to bear their rapid-fire guns. It was drill, no doubt, but drill with a definite purpose, under the unforeseen and unforeseeable conditions of battle, and with all the rivalry of contest, if not of combat, superadded.

The manœuvres of 1889 were carried out on a scale quite as large as those of the previous year, and included fifty ships and gunboats and thirty-eight torpedo-boats. All these were present at the inspection at Spithead, in addition to the Channel Squad-

ron and other vessels in commission, to the number of seventy-three in all. The mimic war lasted two weeks, from the 15th to the 27th of August, and Ireland was again the enemy's country. Tryon and Baird were still the opposing commanders, but this time Tryon took the British side, and Baird that of the enemy.

Instead of attempting to neutralize the enemy's fleet by a blockade, which the experience of 1888 had shown to be futile, the plan of the British defence was to "mask" the enemy's fleet; that is, to take and hold a strategic position in face of it, altering this position as circumstances required, and thereby interposing a perpetual barrier against attack from whatever quarter. The result showed the immense advantages of this plan over the other.

The defending fleet was near its own base, not only of supplies, but, what was of greater importance, of information. The defects of the intelligence service of previous years were remedied by a telegraphic system comprising eight local centres on the coast, connecting with the main centre at the Admiralty, by means of which any vessel moving within the range of an observer's view at any point on the coast was instantly reported in London; and the fact was with almost equal promptness conveyed to the commander-in-chief.

Two principal attempts were made by the enemy, one to pass up the Channel, the other to assail the Scotch and English coast from the North Sea. The first of these, which had London for its objective point, was a failure, and resulted in the capture by the British of two of the assailants' ships, after a warm and protracted engagement. Admiral Baird was severely criticised for the plan of this attack, and with good reason, for he had several fine strategic openings, all of which he neglected or rejected, to carry out a plan of attack too obvious to deceive, too deliberate to surprise, and too feeble to accomplish its purpose by sheer weight of blows.

The other attempt—a raid on the eastern coast by ships passing around the north of Scotland—was somewhat like Fitz Roy's attack of the year before, and wrought equal havoc upon the seaport towns, the squadron exacting heavy ransoms as the price of immunity. The perfected system of conveying intelligence, however, enabled the defending fleet to meet the attack more promptly, and the result was that the raiders left two of their best ships

in the British hands. The fact that they had secured £3,000,000 in "requisitions" from Edinburgh and the other towns on the coast would not make up wholly for the loss of the vessels at a turning-point in the war, when ships were worth far more than money.

The losses of British commerce, notwithstanding the adoption of stricter rules governing detention and capture of prizes, were enormous, amounting to 170,000 tons. The fact was clearly demonstrated that more effectual measures must be taken in case of a war with a maritime power, if Great Britain would seek to defend her commerce at her own doors. Sir George Tryon needed all his cruisers to serve as lookouts and obtain information. He had none to spare for the protection of merchant vessels. Of course the latter made no particular effort to escape from their supposed antagonists; in fact, they carried on their usual occupations on their usual routes precisely as if no war were in progress. But even allowing that one-half of those captured by Baird's cruisers might have made good their escape, the destruction of the remaining half, amounting to 85,000 tons, in two weeks, would have an effect, in actual war, upon marine insurance, freights, the food supply, and the movement of trade in the United Kingdom, that would, unless speedily checked, bring on a colossal financial disaster and go far to put an end to the war.

The general effect of the third series of manœuvres was similar to that of the first two, but in a higher degree. Many of the defects in reference to mobilization, coal supply, information, training of officers and men, and other points, which the earlier attempts had developed, were in a large part corrected. The whole machinery of the Admiralty organization was put to the test of practical working, and a large proportion of the officers and men of the navy got that kind of practical experience which, though it cannot be said to make veterans, gives a familiar insight into the duties that devolve upon naval forces in actual war.

The advantage which the English navy has derived from its manœuvres is conceded on all hands, and the question naturally arises, In what way can our own navy get a similar training? Until a recent period it was in vain to ask the question, for the navy had no ships in which manœuvres of any kind could be attempted. But the time is now not far distant when it will have a sufficient number of modern vessels to enable it to make a be-

ginning, and the work of reconstruction will continue until we have a respectable fleet. Meantime we must labor with what we have. Provision has already been made for pursuing the study of naval strategy as a science : it will only remain, as soon as a sufficient number of modern ships are available, to put the study into practice. For some time to come any manœuvres would necessarily be on a small scale ; they would be measured by the capacity of the fleet. As the fleet reaches its normal standard, their scope could be proportionately enlarged, and they would then become what they are to-day in the more efficient foreign navies—the most important event in the yearly programme of operations.

To say at the present time that this study and practice are beneficial to a navy is mere commonplace : they are absolutely indispensable. A force that drags along a merely routine existence without them is behind the times, and under the pressure of war would be heavily handicapped. It makes little difference what the system of training is called,—a war college or a school of application for the study of the history and principles of strategy, a series of "sham battles" or naval manœuvres, or evolutions for practice,—but under some name or other, and in some vitalized and practical way, a navy must get its training in *war*. The old theory of squadron-cruising, in accordance with which a large force was maintained upon each of several foreign stations, where it lay for a great part of the time in port, and during the remainder cruised aimlessly about, is a thing of the past. Some force undoubtedly must continue to be maintained at certain points at all times, but the true place for a naval force in time of peace is in the waters that wash the shores of its own country. It is here that it should gain the practice that will enable it successfully to defend these shores when they are attacked. It is here that opportunities may be given to coöperate with and train the naval militia of the States, which is certain to become, in the near future, a highly important element in naval defence. It may be added, as an incidental advantage, that it is among its own people that the appropriations for the maintenance of the service can best be expended. For these purposes the true organization is a squadron of evolution, engaged, under conditions copied closely from those of real war, in the actual solution of the problems to which war

would give rise—problems in fleet operations, in blockading and in evading a blockade, in torpedo attack and defence, in the attack and protection of harbors, in chasing and escaping from a chase, in coaling, ruses, learning the plans and movements of an enemy, landing parties, commerce-destroying—the innumerable details of modern naval campaigns towards which all the ordinary peace cruising in the world will furnish no experience.

That Americans have as good a natural fighting capacity as any other people in the world was amply shown in the Civil War. But for success in war against trained enemies they must also have training. The landing of Paul Jones at Whitehaven—the only invasion of English territory in modern times—was brilliantly conceived and boldly executed by an American naval force; but it proved a failure, solely because Jones and his people were imperfectly trained in this sort of work. The war of 1812 was a succession of conspicuous victories at sea, and equally conspicuous disasters on land; and here again the reason for the difference lay in the thorough professional training of one branch and the total absence of training in the other. The real hero of the great naval war was not Hull or Decatur or Macdonough, or any of the others who won its victories. It was Edward Preble, who, in the lesser war with Tripoli ten years before, had formed the men, almost without exception, by whom the later victories were won. The navy that we require to defend our coast to-day is a navy composed, like that of 1812, first of all of Americans, of men imbued with the national sentiment, and, secondly, of men who have been thoroughly trained to their business. Given such a force, with modern ships and weapons, and enough of them, and the maritime defence of the United States will cease to be a doubtful and disturbing question.

JAMES R. SOLEY.

VAMPIRE LITERATURE.

BY ANTHONY COMSTOCK.

Not long ago a very fashionably-attired young woman called at the office of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice and asked to see the writer. She wanted to know if it was against the law to publish a "spicy book." I looked at her in amazement, as she was young, of slight form and very intelligent appearance, when, with perfect *sang froid,* she informed me that she was an actress and had written a "peculiar book," which she unblushingly described, to bring her name prominently before the public. She had taken her manuscript to a publisher, who, after looking it over, had advised her to submit it to our society. She then inquired if I would promise not to touch the book if she could secure a publisher for it.

Being informed that such a book would surely be seized if published, she wished to know if she could not pay us not to attack the book if published as she had prepared it! Pains were taken to inform her of the various decisions of the courts of England and this country, and she was advised, with great minuteness, of the law and its bearings upon such publications. Receiving a very emphatic negative to her delicate proposition that she should pay some money not to have her book attacked, she next asked whether, if she should change the book so as to make it conform to the law, we would not "attack it just a little," and seize a few copies if she paid us for doing so, so as to attract attention to her book and get the newspapers to notice it. This proposition brought only another disappointment to her hopes. She said she did not care about any odium from publishing the book; the only thing she was anxious about was that we should promise not to arrest her, as she did not want to be arrested and locked up.

It was suggested to her that she had better submit her manuscript for examination. She said that she would, only she was

afraid it was so bad that we would destroy it. We assured her that if her manuscript was of a doubtful character we would submit it to the district attorney for his opinion, and be bound by that opinion. She finally left, expressing sorrow and regret that she had come to our office, as now she would not dare publish her book, as she had set her heart upon doing.

It was both sad and ludicrous to hear this fair young woman pleading to be allowed to publish her obscene book in order to advertise her name and lift it into prominence before the public. Her motives as avowed are typical of a certain class of modern writers who place the sensuous products of their minds before the public for fame and pay. Money and a large advertisement of their names before the public as authors are all the reward that many writers ask for prostituting their genius and talents to base purposes. There seem to be a criminal indifference and recklessness on the part of many writers and publishers as to what results flow from the dissemination of their leprous products.

The first thing after an author has written a book of questionable character is to secure some reputable publisher or bookseller to handle and push it. The next step towards the realization of his desire for fame and gain is to have the book roundly attacked because of its lustful tendencies, by the daily and weekly papers and periodicals. The New York Society for the Suppression of Vice long ago learned that to attack a book or paper, and not carry through the prosecution to success in the courts, was to secure a quasi-indorsement by the courts and a large amount of free advertising for the offensive matter. Our plan has always been to discover the author and publisher, and secretly strike a blow at the fountain-head by seizing the publication and plates and arresting the publisher and author.

The care taken by the society in the preparation of cases may be illustrated by the results for the past three years. During 1888, of 103 cases brought to trial 101 were convicted. In 1889, out of 127 cases brought to trial 125 were convicted; while during 1890 we had 155 convictions out of 156 cases. This record speaks well for our district attorneys, as well as for the preparation of these cases.

Again, this society has always aimed to reach authors and publishers, and not merely venders. This is illustrated by the fact that out of 227 different books published in this country,

the stereotypes and electroplates, woodcuts and steel and copper-plate engravings for printing and illustrating 225 have been seized and destroyed; while the plates for the other two books were destroyed by the publisher for fear we would secure them and prosecute him.

It is both lamentable and disheartening, just as the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice has practically suppressed the grosser books and pictures which for years have cursed this country, that we should have an epidemic of lewdness through the channels of light literature. There is at present a strong competition among writers and publishers of cheap books and papers to see which one can excel the others in unclean stories.

The object and ambition of many writers seem to be to show how they can evade the law and yet publish stories of a suggestive and criminal character. The basest representatives of profligacy and unhallowed living are made the subjects for leading characters in many novels published at the present day. Many news-stands are no longer either safe or respectable places for children and youth to visit or purchase books at. Many of the publications are of such a character that they are sufficient when seen in the hands of any girl to blast her good name and reputation. A respectable person scarcely knows what novel to select from the numerous products offered by the newsdealers, and many books publicly offered for sale no decent person would be seen carrying in his or her hands upon a public conveyance.

There are two things of immense importance to be considered in this connection. The first is the class to be affected and the results of this kind of devil seed-sowing; the second, the kindred vices that are preying upon the youth of to-day.

As to the first, nearly one-third of the entire people of the United States are twenty-one years of age or under. This means that upwards of *twenty millions* of youth and children are in the plastic or receptive state, open to every insidious teacher, and subject to every bad influence—a period of life when character is forming and is most easily moulded.

Nor must we forget that the children of to-day are not only to be the men and women of to-morrow, but also the parents of a still more future generation. *This nation's highest interests to-day centre in these millions of youth and children.* Religion and morality are the only safe foundations for a nation's future pros-

perity and security. Any other foundations will crumble before the encroachments of vicious propensities and criminal avarice. By cursing the youth of to-day we heavily discount the prosperity of the future of this nation, and endanger the permanency of our national institutions. *These writers and publishers are conspirators against the nation's highest hopes for the future.*

Such authors may coin money from their publications; they may attain popular positions before the public; but as sure as the night follows the day, so sure must this nation's harvest from this seed-sowing of popularized nastiness be corrupt lives and blotches upon the face of society. These authors may evade the laws of the land, but they cannot evade the natural consequences that are sure to flow from the dissemination of their vile publications.

"Oh, but," some author says, "my story always has a moral!" What does the boy care for a moral after his mind has been engrossed, his imagination fired, and his passions aroused by some florid description of the precincts of sin, or of the loose conduct of the vile principal characters? What boy or girl stops to read the moral of a sensational story of bloodshed, lust, or crime?

The worst blow that can be dealt such a book is silent contempt. Why notice such a book at all? Why not send it back to the author or publisher? Is not the sending of a dirty book for favorable notice an insult to decency, and to the one to whom it is sent? A good man named McDowell, before our day as a society, undertook to suppress obscene publications by denouncing the authors, disclosing the methods of trading in such matters, and describing how such books were advertised, and how they were kept hidden or stored away by those dealing in them. This served the venders of filth as one of the very best means of advertising that could have been employed.

There are various other sources of danger to the youth of this country to which it is proper to call attention before passing to the laws and decisions of the courts affecting this kind of literature.

The secular press, by the sickening details of loathsome and reeking crimes, is invading our homes with matters which blast the finer sensibilities and spread the pestilential seeds of crime and vice. Distilled from the daily papers, come the weekly illustrated

papers of crime, which flaunt their degrading influences from news-stands and shop windows, to the detriment of the morals of our boys and girls.

Other subtile influences are also exerted. The tendency to scoff at religion, to rail at moral reform; the practice of emphasizing infidel and blasphemous lectures and subjects by full reports; and the advertisements of "personal" and "quack" medical notices and books, all are exerting a silent influence in the wrong direction. While they destroy respect for holy things, they breed also a disregard for those higher and nobler qualities of mind which make for good.

Then, again, we have the "boy-and-girl story papers," the "nickel" and "dime novels," and so-called "monthly libraries" of cheap literature. Many of these are revealers of criminal secrets, instructors in the science of crime. Crime is glorified. The leading character in many of these stories is a criminal, who succeeds in winning a fortune for himself by setting at defiance the laws of the land. Morality and virtue are treated as things to be despised, while reckless living is made the means of rapid transit from poverty to affluence.

Better that our youth be taken by their parents into the sinks of iniquity and dens of vice, and their finer sensibilities shocked by the realities of crime, than that their fancies shall be taught fantastic scenes from these sensational and vivid descriptions of the purlieus of sin and shame.

Our newspapers are constantly filled with accounts of the victims of "dime novels" or "blood-and-thunder" story papers. To show something of the enormous amount of this kind of criminal literature, we may cite the fact that six tons' weight of books and plates was seized by this society in a single office of one of these criminal story-paper publishers.

It was not long ago that, in Westchester County, three lads, crazed by these stories of crime, under a fourteen-year-old leader, presented a loaded revolver at the head of a gentleman upon the public street and demanded "your money or your life."

A few years ago we arrested a young man at Newburg, N. Y., who, hearing that the officers of the law were after him, had armed himself with a bowie knife. When asked what he had that for, he replied: "I heard you were after me, and so I fixed myself." The next day he and his young associate, after being

locked up in a cell over night, confessed that they were victims of these "boy-and-girl" story papers. Both had been expelled from an institution of learning for insubordination and disorder.

A youth in one of our Western States, under fourteen years of age, was recently hung by a mob of citizens for having, in his mad craze to be famous like the boys in the stories he had been reading, shot three men.

A few months ago a lad about thirteen was arraigned in the Tombs Police Court, in New York, for shooting a boy about his own age. The evidence disclosed the fact that some boys had been gambling; that a dispute arose over a pencil, during which one of the boys told this young desperado that he "lied"; whereupon, after the manner of the hero of a story, the young gambler arose from his seat at the gaming-table, drew his revolver, saying, "Johnnie, that's got to be wiped out with blood," and shot his little companion down.

The newspapers recently contained an account of a gang of boys, all under fourteen, who had bound themselves together under solemn pledge and oath as a band of bandits, and in solemn conclave an order had been issued that each boy should slay his own mother. One young lad started to practise on a servant girl before attacking his mother and was arrested for assault, and the details of the conspiracy were thus discovered.

Many a boy or youth has been led to commit crimes which have brought him to the penitentiary or the State's prison, from the infection or seduction of this class of crime-breeding publications.

There is still another class of books which are to-day appearing in great numbers, comparatively speaking, which reflect no honor on those who make them a source of personal profit and gain. Many publishers seem to have searched the archives of foreign libraries for erotic books, classics, standard literature, suppressed editions of notoriously vile writers of old, and these are translated, or obscene selections taken from them, and bound up in cheap sensational shape, and placed in indiscriminate circulation with a wanton desire to make money from the sale thereof, utterly regardless of the degrading effect of the matter thus reduced from literary purposes to sensational circulation.

Garbage smells none the less rank and offensive because deposited in a marble fount or a gold or silver urn. So these foul stories

and unclean tales of ancient writers find no justification in the moral world simply because clothed in smooth verse or choice rhetoric. Decaying matter breeds disease, whether confined in costly receptacles or ash-barrels. So this wretched tainted matter, stolen from ancient writers, which is made to appeal to the depraved taste, is equally deadly in its polluting effects; indeed, it is in some respects worse, for coarse words shock and disgust, while the smooth flow of genius and talent thus prostituted more easily deludes and captivates the fancy and engages attention.

Some years ago a book-dealer on Broadway undertook to publish a cheap edition of a grossly obscene book, which in the original tongue was and is regarded as a text-book of pure Italian of the fourteenth century. To make it still more sensational, he added certain engravings, and then advertised and sold it at a cheap price. The sale of this publication was stopped by this society.

There is a mistaken idea, which largely prevails, that anything, no matter how corrupting and indecent it may be, which appears in classical or standard literature, may be disseminated indiscriminately. Classical and standard literature is designed for literary men and for literary purposes. When of an obscene nature, such books are properly restricted in every well-regulated public library, and should be kept from general circulation and confined to literary purposes, precisely the same as standard medical works, containing anatomical plates, are restricted in their sale to physicians and medical students.

These cheap, garbled translations, with additional matter added to quicken the sale, are of no earthly value to any literary or professional person; they are "quack" literary publications, and are of no importance except to promote the greed for gain of the man who publishes them in this form. There is no sound principle to justify the parading of such ancient indecencies in literature before the rising generation; and the book-seller, whether on Broadway, Fifth Avenue, Fourteenth or Twenty-third Street, or in the lowest slums of the city, should be dealt with like any other dealer in disreputable and immoral works. To call these cheap, garbled translations "classics," and to make no distinction between the original and these bastard publications, is an insult to modern intelligence.

Again, medical books, with plates showing the anatomy of the human body, are misappropriated to illustrate pamphlets which are made the advertising medium of some quack medical institution or quack doctor; these last, sent out indiscriminately through the mails of the United States, going into the homes of the land in unsealed packages, liable to be opened by any class in the community, are an outrage upon the family and an insult to every person to whom they are sent.

It seems strange that men of intelligence and literary culture should fail to make the distinction between legitimate classical, standard literature, or medical works restricted to their proper and legitimate purposes, and these cheap and garbled publications and translations when sold indiscriminately and in such a way as to be liable to fall under the notice and attention of those for whom such publications are neither fitted nor designed. The popular idea concerning this class of books, no matter how vile or how indiscriminately circulated, is that the vender or publisher cannot be interfered with by the law. Such is not the law, however.

Another popular delusion is that, if a writer claims not to intend to harm others, he cannot be interfered with; that an artist may set up for himself a certain ideal or standard of morality; that he may undertake to expose vice, and by so doing may make pictures that are shocking to modesty and offensive to decency, but that as long as his motive is commendable his pictures cannot be condemned. Again, it is maintained that, if it does not appear that the motive or intent of the vender or writer of a book is bad, then the matter is not to be considered in any other light than as intended by the writer or vender thereof. Many good lawyers have contended in court that we must show the "guilty intent" of the person accused in order to make out a case of "selling an obscene book or picture."

It seems exceedingly fitting just at this time, when there are so many of these cheap novels and abortive attempts at reproducing translations from standard and other literary works, that we should consider not only the effects of this sensual matter upon the twenty millions of youth in this country, but also the legal principles which govern this very important subject.

Classical, standard, literary, and medical works are all indictable if sold in such a manner as to reach and corrupt the young

and inexperienced. The principles of common law which have prevailed for more than a century and a half are tersely laid down in a celebrated case decided in 1727 in the King's Bench Court in England, in Rex *vs.* Curl, to wit:

"Peace includes good order and government, and that peace may be broken in many instances without an actual force, to wit:
"I. If it be an act against the constitution and civil government.
"II. If it be against religion.
"III. If it be against morality."

This principle was affirmed in 1815 in the great leading case of Commonwealth *vs.* Sharpless *et al.* in Pennsylvania,—the defendant being indicted for exhibiting an obscene work of art, a painting,—where it was again held that

"what tended to corrupt society is a breach of the peace, and punishable by indictment. . . . Hence it follows that any offence may be punished, if in its nature and by its example it *tends* to the *corruption* of morals, although it be not committed in public." (2 Serg. & Rawle 102.)

These principles have been affirmed and reaffirmed for more than a century and a half by all the higher courts in England and America.

The leading case against the sale of obscene books in this century is that of the Queen *vs.* Hicklin, tried in Queen's Bench Court, England, before Lord Chief-Justice Cockburn and a full bench, in 1867. Hicklin was charged with the sale of a book which the prosecution admitted and conceded was written in the interest of the Protestant religion, and sold by Hicklin from a good motive, to expose, as he claimed, the errors of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the evils of the confessional. Hicklin made no profit, but sold the book at cost, as a member of an anti-Romanist society. Mr. Kydd, a learned barrister, appeared for Hicklin. He did what many a lawyer in this country has attempted to do—offered the substance of other and standard works as justification, on the ground that the matter under indictment was not worse than matters existing in other works which are tolerated. The Lord Chief-Justice said:

"I think the test of obscenity is this: whether the tendency of the matter charged as obscenity is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences, and into whose hands a publication of this sort may fall."

This test of obscenity has been adopted and affirmed in every case of importance tried since upon both continents, until it is

now the settled test for a jury. It was a few years afterwards applied in this country in the most celebrated case ever tried in the United States courts regarding the sending of obscene matters through the mail. Judge Benedict, in charging the jury, after citing the above test, added :

"Now, gentlemen, I have given you the test ; it is not a question of whether it would corrupt the morals, tend to deprave your minds or the minds of every person ; it is a question whether it *tends* to deprave the minds of those open to such influences, and into whose hands a publication of this character might come. It is within the law if it would suggest impure and libidinous thoughts in the young and inexperienced." (U. S. *vs.* Bennett.)

There is also a unanimity in the decisions of the courts in England and the United States upon the impropriety and unlawfulness of offering for indiscriminate circulation in popular form medical, standard, and literary works where they contain matters relating to sexual organs, or stories replete with lewd, indecent, and obscene suggestions. These decisions need to be emphasized at the present time. Many publishers are reckless, and doubtless ignorant of them. Says the United States Court in Illinois :

"Illustrated pamphlets, consisting partially of extracts from standard works on medicine and surgery, but of an obscene and indecent character, and intended for general circulation, are within section 3893 R. S. of U. S." (U. S. *vs.* Cheeseman, 19 Fed. R. 495.)

This is the section prohibiting obscene matters from being transmitted by mail.

The Court of Appeals in the Müller case confirms and affirms the same principle by saying:

"We do not doubt that whether a publication is obscene or not may in some cases depend upon circumstances. For example, a medical book for the instruction of medical men may contain illustrations suitable and proper as a part of the work, but which if detached and published alone for circulation might be deemed indecent within the statute." (Peo. *vs.* Müller, 96 N. Y. 413.)

In the light of these just decisions, what of the publication in pamphlet form, at low and popular prices, of garbled translations of classical literature or standard works of an obscene, lewd, and indecent character ? What of the reproduction of resurrected nasty books, which were supposed to have passed away with the death of their authors, in which publishers of the present day are

trying to outrival one another, by unearthing and reprinting them in popular form? Is not the practice reprehensible and the business damnable? Such reckless disregard of the welfare of the twenty millions of youth in this country calls for the strongest expressions of condemnation.

The intent of the author or vender has nothing to do with the question whether a book placed in a child's hands or in the possession of another person is or is not obscene, lewd, or indecent. The question in all cases is *a question of fact for a jury.* A committing magistrate has nothing to do with this question of fact, nor with the motive of the defendant. His duty is to ascertain whether the book complained of was sold, and whether there is probable cause to believe the defendant sold it. He cannot exercise the prerogatives of a jury. Indeed, there is no decision in conflict, that I have ever heard of or been able to discover, during the past century and a half, or since the Curl case in 1727. As many lawyers will contend that there can be no crime where there is no criminal intent, it will be necessary to produce authorities to sustain my proposition.

The Court of Appeals of the State of New York has in explicit terms defined section 317 of the penal code, or the act to suppress obscene publications. It says:

"The statute makes the selling of an obscene and indecent picture a misdemeanor. *There is no exception by reason of any special intent in making the sale.*"

Returning to the leading English case (Queen *vs.* Hicklin), we find the full bench, through its Lord Chief-Justice, saying upon the subject:

"It is a universal principle that when a man is charged with doing an act of which the probable consequences may be highly injurious, the intention is an inference of law resulting from the doing of the act, and although the appellant may have had another object in view he must be taken to have intended that which is the natural consequence of the act. If he does an act which is illegal, it does not make it legal that he did it with some other object. That is not a legal excuse unless the object was such as under the circumstances rendered the particular act lawful."

Subsequently a man named Brannon undertook to publish a copy of the proceedings in Hicklin's case, and embodied the same matter upon which Hicklin had been convicted, and thought to justify his act on the ground of no evil intent, asserting that his book was only a verbatim report of the legal proceed-

ings in a court. He was convicted, and upon his appealing his case the court held :

"The probable effect of the publication of this book being prejudicial to public morality and decency, the appellant must be taken to have intended the natural consequences of such publication, even though the book was published with the object referred to by his counsel." (Steele *vs.* Brannon, 7 L. R. C. L. 267.)

The object of all the laws prohibiting the dissemination of obscene matter is the same—to protect the morals of the young and inexperienced ; and where publications endanger these morals those writings come clearly within the purview and condemnation of the law.

This article is written in the hope that the blind may be made to see and the erring to correct their ways, so as to lessen the dangers now threatening the rising generation.

Our country is making mighty strides towards affluence and prosperity. Mighty responsibilities are keeping pace with every step in advance made by this nation. Unless the restraining forces of religion and morality keep ahead of all other considerations, the ship of state will soon be dashed to pieces upon the boulders and quicksands of immorality.

Save our youth from this fetid blast of corruption which is being sent out by the fiery greed of thoughtless, reckless, or criminal authors and publishers. Authors and publishers need to call a halt upon themselves, ere they further curse the youth of this free land and undermine our free institutions.

ANTHONY COMSTOCK.

POSSIBILITIES OF THE STEAM YACHT.

BY LEWIS HERRESHOFF.

THE passion for rapid transit, now in full force on land, is becoming general also at sea.

During the last half-decade we have seen the Atlantic covered from land to land in rapidly-lessening time. Hour by hour the passage has been cut down, and to-day trips of less than six days are of such common occurrence that they excite scarcely a passing notice.

In yachting, as well as in the merchant marine, the increasing desire for high speed has been felt, so that a love of rapid motion, once considered devoid of the spirit of sportsmanship, has become so popular that it is quite the ordinary thing to require eighteen or twenty miles an hour for the usual performance of a yacht. There is something exciting in high speed. It stimulates interest that otherwise might be tame. It matters little what force is employed—the bellying sail, the whirling screw, or the dashing paddle—so there is "a bone in her teeth," and particularly if some other yacht is slowly dropping astern, then is the time when your pulses fly and your interest is awakened, as if by some invisible sympathy the straining steel or tugging canvas might receive through your anxiety a fresh measure of power.

Here in America the conditions are conducive to the development of high speed in yachts. We are a restless, quickly-moving people, and many wish to live during the yachting season at a distance from business, where many miles must be traversed daily. Nowhere on the globe do inland water courses afford so ready and agreeable means of rapid transit as with us. The Hudson, the Sound, and the many beautiful bays that diversify

our coast line bear the forms of numerous swift steam yachts whose owners must be "on 'change" at 10 A. M., and whose delight it is to cut the waters with the chisel-edge of their bows and leave a glistening wake far in the rear.

In England it is otherwise. They are not so "fast," as a people, as we, and, more than that, their surroundings are not favorable for the comfortable and successful use of high-speed steam yachts; they tend more toward sea-going, moderate-powered vessels, that will make easily and safely a voyage to the Mediterranean, or the coast of Norway, or wherever they choose, for the entire earth is the playground of the English. We owe much, however, to the English in the development of the torpedo-boat, which is of very near kin to a speedy steam yacht. If we omit the warlike implements, and increase a little the size and comfort-giving appointments of the cabin, such a craft is the very best form of high-speed yacht that can be devised.

Since the demand for speed is not limited, and since we see year by year new ocean racers of superior power and swiftness, and yachts or torpedo-boats that excel those of last year's construction, the question naturally comes forward, how far can this passion for speed be carried and still result in the use of reasonably safe and durable vessels? It is a query that never can be fully and definitely answered. So long as improvements in material and mechanism can be made, so long will the last production be the fastest and best.

In using the term "high speed" it is intended to mean at least twenty miles an hour. A speed of less than that is reached with comparative ease with materials and modes of construction already in practice. Let it also be understood that the mile as here considered is the statute mile, containing 5,280 feet; the nautical mile, or knot, has 6,080 feet, and while the latter is in sole use at sea, it is found that the statute mile is more convenient in yachting, particularly where the average cruising-ground is in land-locked water or near coast lines.

The improvement of speed in steam yachts can best be considered in three divisions; namely, the form and construction of the hull, the motive power, and the means of propulsion. These subjects we will discuss in order.

The form or model of a vessel has been the chief subject of study by naval architects for many years, and really astonishing

improvements have been made even during the present generation. While the form of a vessel is of prime value when a fixed, moderate speed is required, when high speed is sought the model takes a secondary place, and is supplanted by the proportion of width to length, or, in more exact terms, the relation of the sectional area to the length. It is, however, presumed that some regard is to be paid to the lines; that is, an attempt is made to mould the form so as to present an easy entrance and exit.

There is a certain speed that attaches to every vessel, which may be called its natural rate; it is mainly governed by its length and the length of the carrier wave which always accompanies a vessel parallel to her line of motion. When a vessel reaches a speed great enough to form a wave of the same length as the moving body, then that vessel has reached her natural rate of speed, and all that can be obtained above that is done by sheer brute force. The natural limit of speed of a boat 40 feet long is about 10 miles an hour; a vessel 60 feet will show 12¼ miles; one 100 feet, 15¾ miles; one 200 feet, 22 miles.

The power employed in propelling a vessel up to her natural limit is in regular proportion to the cube of the speed attained; but when she is forced above that point, the power expended is in greatly increased ratio. For instance, imagine a vessel the natural speed of which is fifteen miles an hour, to obtain which 350 indicated horse-power is required; then the power for twelve miles an hour would be about 180 horse-power; for eighteen miles, over 700 horse-power, and for twenty miles, about 1,000 horse-power. This illustration is approximate, depending on the displacement and weight of the vessel.

The greatly increased power required in making the higher speeds is absorbed by forcing the vessel up an inclined plane, owing to the situation of the carrier wave, the crest of which is so located that the larger portion of the hull is on the falling side, causing the vessel to climb, as it were. Much power is also absorbed by a secondary series of waves.

In this situation lightness of construction will be found to be the greatest factor of speed so far as the hull is concerned, general proportions being first. In the future high-speed yacht we must look more to the subject of lightness of construction, so that greater swiftness can be attained.

In the construction of vessels less than eighty or one hundred feet in length, it is found that wood can be employed with better results of lightness when a reasonable degree of strength and durability is required. In vessels of the size mentioned, if of steel construction, it would be found that durability would be sacrificed if a hull sufficiently light were built to attain the highest speed. Thin steel plates can be made only fairly durable by the utmost care, such as frequent painting, and have to be kept as little as possible afloat, particularly if in salt water.

Some attempts have been successfully made to modify the form of a yacht, with a view to preventing the tendency to lose proper fore-and-aft trim when at top speed. The yacht "Now Then" is a well-known example. Her stern is carried out into "a straight flat," a fan-tail; it slides over the surface of the water, and prevents her stern from settling. As a factor of speed it is successful, not only in its designed intention, but in preventing the access of air to the region of the screw, thus allowing it to be placed near the level of the surface of the surrounding water without danger of racing.

Some improvement in the model of vessels may be made so as to lessen the size and number of secondary waves formed when at high speed; or by a change in the model it may be possible to mount the carrier wave so as to bring the weight of the hull on the forward or advancing side, when an effect similar to sliding down hill can be had, which result has already been reached in extreme examples of high speed, mostly by torpedo-boats.

The most hopeful quarter in which to look for increase of speed from modification of hull is through the employment of new material that combines lightness, strength, and non-liability to corrosion; but at present it is difficult to see where such a material can be found. Aluminum bronze is near it and doubtless will be used in the near future, but it is too costly, and has practical difficulties besides. Much also may be expected from the alloys of steel and aluminum and steel and nickel, which, so far as lightness and strength are concerned, leave little to be reasonably hoped for.

A factor of speed not always the recipient of proper attention is the character of the wetted surface of a vessel. A smooth, glossy surface, and one that repels water, is greatly to be desired, to which qualities that of anti-fouling must be added. Some of

these qualities are found in applications in present use; but much can and must be done to lessen the drag of friction on hulls, particularly if they be of metallic construction.

The motive power should perhaps receive the first place in the consideration of high speed, as it stands at the head of prime factors of all progress in manufacturing, railway practice, and navigation. The steam-engine is the only motor that has ever been successfully employed in the attainment of high speed, and from the present outlook it appears as if it would continue to occupy its well-earned position. In the last ten or fifteen years several new motors have been brought to the attention of the public, but for the purposes of this article they are unworthy of consideration.

Electricity has been successfully employed in small vessels as a motive power, but high speed with it has not been reached; yet it would be unwise to say, in face of the astonishing advancement in electrical science, that it may not at some future day answer some special requirement; but as we find it to-day it is absolutely useless where high power and fairly long periods of functioning are necessary.

The steam-engine in its usual form is poorly adapted to use in the development of high power. Steam at pressures far above those employed in the time of the plain or even the compound engine is now commonly and successfully used. Steam above 250 pounds' pressure to the square inch is a far different agent from what it is at pressures generally employed a few years ago. In many of the new torpedo-boats of the smaller class, steam at 300 pounds' pressure is used; and if possibilities are to be considered it is best to take that as a probable pressure.

An engine, to work successfully under a pressure of at least 250 pounds and with 400 revolutions a minute, must be specially designed for such high duty. Not only must the material be the best obtainable, but the bearing surfaces must be greatly increased in area, so that unusual strains can be carried at great velocity, thus allowing adequate chances for lubrication.

In making large cables for bridge-building, wire is used that will stand a pull of 250,000 pounds for each square inch of sectional area, but steel of such abnormal strength cannot be obtained in large masses, even one inch in diameter. So the engine-builder must be content with steel that will sustain a tensional

strain of only 65,000 pounds, and if he finds it with all the other desirable properties, he is fortunate.

In considering the possibilities of the engine, the greatest hope is in reducing the ratio of weight to power. It is the same idea as in the improvement of the hull—reduction of weight with increase of strength. The "Stiletto's" engine weighs ten pounds for each indicated horse-power; it is a compound engine of peculiar design, but since the date of its construction new conditions have surrounded the marine engine, and to-day the working pressure has nearly doubled over that used six years ago, when the "Stiletto" raced with the "Mary Powell" on the Hudson. So far as the engine alone is concerned, the compound will give a higher duty for its weight than those of higher expansion; but the latter have so many marked advantages that their employment where high speeds are desired is now considered the best practice in marine engineering.

In the triple and quadruple expansion engine the forces are more widely distributed than in the compound, and they are capable of being more exactly balanced; so vibrations are not communicated to the hull in such violent form as with the compound.

The engines of the torpedo-boat "Cushing" are perhaps the best form for high speed extant; they have each five cylinders, so that the expansion is quadruple (the low-pressure cylinder being divided), the strains are widely distributed, the moving parts as light and as well balanced as possible; with the exertion of 1,600 indicated horse-power they run smoothly and with less risk of injury by momentum of connections, and will function for a longer period under trying conditions than any other form of engine in use.

The engines of the "Cushing" exert a horse-power for each fifteen pounds' weight, but, although heavier than the engines having lower rates of expansion, still by reason of greater economy less coal need be supplied to perform a given amount of work; so the displacement of the vessel is no greater.

It is not expected that the form or general arrangement of the present torpedo-boat engine will undergo much change to fulfil increased demands; but improvements in material, details of moving parts with a view of rendering the machine more easily manipulated, etc., seem easily within reach, and already are receiving the earnest attention of designers.

The generator of steam, or boiler (as in old times it was called), presents a wider field for improvement than any other element of the motive power. As in the case of the hull and engine, the great question to be solved is to lessen weight and at the same time to increase power, both in ability to carry higher pressure and in freedom of steaming. When pressures of 250 or 300 pounds per square inch are considered, the shell boiler is prohibited at the outset, on account of the great weight that would be required to withstand such a pressure.

The tubular boiler is a form that has received a large share of attention from builders, and still its condition is far from satisfactory when economy of fuel, durability, light weight, and accessibility are considered. The more the boiler is subdivided into many integral parts, the lighter each part or tube can be made, the more is danger resulting from a rupture lessened. It is confidently expected that some alloy of aluminum and copper will soon be used in boiler-making, especially as a material for the tubes. Steel is too liable to injury by corrosion from within, as well as from outward exposure. It is true that steel, so long as it lasts, can be made as thin as required for extreme lightness; yet in the consideration of future possibilities it is assumed that practicability is not to be wholly waived, nor the entire construction given over to the one object of high speed.

It is quite reasonable to think that great improvements will be made in fuels and their management. Much has been done with coals, and more can be if always the best means be employed in its combustion. Mechanical stoking and cleaning of fires can be practised with success in high service. The mechanical control of fires is also highly desirable from a humanitarian viewpoint. At high pressures steam is so hot that unless all pipes and exposed surfaces of the boiler be carefully isolated, the temperature of both engine- and boiler-room may become unbearable, even with the best means taken for circulation by fans. Many experiments have been made with liquid fuel, with some measure of success, but while this fuel is very desirable because easily managed and controlled, still its use for even special situations has not prevailed; still with so many determined inventors and experimenters it is to be hoped that some system may be reached by which the hydrocarbons may find the place in marine engineering that they deserve.

The means of propulsion do not present so wide a field for improvement as the foregoing. The paddle and screw are the only agents that are worthy of special notice.

The paddle is best adapted to comparatively sheltered waters, and on account of slow motion the machinery connected with it must be more heavy and ponderous than that for driving a screw. Very high speeds have been reached by the use of the paddle, and still greater results can be obtained by perfecting the means of feathering and by close attention to the elimination of everything that would disturb the surface of the water through which the vessel is passing.

The screw is far more advantageous than the paddle for the development of high speed. It is much lighter, and on account of the rapidity of revolution the engine can also be less weighty than in case of the paddle. With a screw well immersed and favorably situated as to working in fairly undisturbed water, the amount of power that can be transmitted through it is amazing.

Recent transoceanic practice is decidedly tending toward the use of the twin screw, and by its employment the fastest passages across the Atlantic have been made; but it may be doubted if just as swift passages might not be made with a single screw using the same power. The use of the twin screw, however, has many marked advantages which cannot fail to place it in the highest rank of marine adjuncts where speed and safety are prime consideration.

Triple screws have also been successfully used, but the advantage of their employment for other than special reasons can well be doubted. The form of the propeller screw has been a subject of deep study and untiring experiment. The gain in efficiency from the commonest to the best approved form is so slight that we cannot expect with reason much increase of speed from that quarter. All that can be done is to make the screw of the best and strongest material, of the best design, polish it, and balance it; and if it be placed in a situation where it can work in the least disturbed water, then all is done that can be done, and with the exception of the oft-suggested improvement in material little can be expected from the future screw to increase the speed of vessels.

A comparison of the weights of the entire motive plant of different steam vessels shows that much has been done in reducing the weights and consequently the displacement.

The motive plant of the "Cushing" weighs about sixty-five pounds for each horse-power exerted; that of the steamship "City of Paris" about 200 pounds; the former has eight times the power when compared with the displacement of the latter.

Some idea of the power required to attain the highest speed in small vessels may be had by the above comparison. The "City of Paris" at her top speed is not forced beyond her natural rate, while the torpedo-boat is driven far beyond her rate as prescribed by length and displacement.

From a general view of the subject it would appear that no marked gain in speed can be reached by confining the attention to any one element or factor of speed; but by a constant devotion to the details of construction, particularly with a view to lessening weights, much can be done to increase the speed of yachts and other vessels, even with the materials now obtainable.

With means now available a speed for a yacht of twenty-eight miles an hour is quite within our reach; that is, for a run of five hours' duration. Shorter runs at a rate of thirty-one miles an hour have been made by a few torpedo-boats, and whatever this class of vessels can do may be taken as a measure of the possibilities of a yacht, and indeed more; for when the warlike apparatus is omitted the chances for attaining the highest speed are increased.

It would not be wise to place an actual limit on possible speed, but we can only admit that, as progress has been made in the last decade, raising speeds from 40 to 50 per cent., it is not unreasonable to expect a still further gain, although not so marked a one. It is surely within the bounds of reason to say that by the opening of the new century steam yachts having a speed of thirty-five miles an hour will be no uncommon thing; and it is also to be hoped that, with the improvement of materials of construction, there will be a like strengthening of human tissue, both in nerve and muscle, for both will be taxed to their utmost in the management of machinery and the guidance of vessels under such conditions.

LEWIS HERRESHOFF.

NOTE.—A steam yacht built to the order of William E. Hearst, of San Francisco, Cal., has just been launched in Bristol, R. I. She is 112 feet long, and has an engine of 800 horse-power. This yacht is intended to be the fastest afloat. By the terms of the contract she must attain a speed of twenty-five miles an hour. She is seaworthy enough to make the voyage to the Pacific coast by the way of the Straits of Magellan.—L. H.

THE SCIENTIFIC BASIS OF BELIEF.

BY ROBERT H. THURSTON, DIRECTOR OF SIBLEY COLLEGE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

MAN is a soul imprisoned and residing in mechanism, a spirit, the image of God, brought to earth, and with all potentialities embodied. His mechanism is distinguished from those of lower orders simply by the greater perfection of the organism in which his existence is passed in the seen universe; his spirit from the higher orders of intelligences and existences by the fact that he is only able to attain the ends for which he is imprisoned, for a time, on this earth, through the operation of physical structures. He advances by the aid of physical forces and of chemical changes which his enclosing apparatus and machinery are especially fitted to produce, or to take advantage of, in the intricate series of operations which he, automatically or by choice, performs as his work in this world. His visible representative is a marvellous machine; but it is a machine simply. He himself is of the invisible.

This man comes out of the unseen universe, spends a short life in the seen, and returns as mysteriously to the unseen when his work is done and his mortal life ends. He is a composite of soul, intellect, and accidental physical accessories. While we often meet with ill-defined and uncertain evidences that he has other means and methods of cognition of the universes, both seen and unseen, it is invariably the fact that his soul, his intellect, and his physical senses are so intimately related that he gains substantially all his knowledge, of the seen at least, through the aid of the senses alone; he gains, we think and hope, some slight acquaintance with the unseen through the workings of the mind.

When Paulinus was endeavoring to convert the English king, it is said by the historian that no thought was so effeective in

shaking the king's faith in his heathen gods as that of the old priest: "So seems the life of man, O king! as a sparrow's flight through the hall, when you are sitting at meat in winter-tide, with the warm fire lighted on the hearth, but the icy rain-storm without. The sparrow flies in at one door, and tarries for a moment in the light and heat; then, flying forth from the other, vanishes into the wintry darkness whence it came: so tarries in our sight for a moment the life of man; but what is before it and what after it we know not." But modern science has, in the midst of its strivings for more tangible and immediately appreciable results, given us some light in this direction; and we are able to see farther into the hitherto unseen and invisible than in the days of the old Saxons, and vastly farther and more clearly than in the times of the prophets of Israel. Science is beginning to see a probability, at least, that the seen is the issue of the unseen; that all life, all characteristics of the living, all the material, the vital, the spiritual of humanity, not only have come out of the unseen, but that they have brought to us all that exists in the unseen, in such varying proportions as humanity, in its imperfect completeness, is capable of accepting; that life, like matter and all other existences, is actually immortal.

Man is composed of all the elements, and in his self, as in his body, in his intangible, as in his tangible, composition, he comprehends a part of every element of the unseen. As in his body we may, by refined chemical analysis, find in muscle, blood, and bones not only oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, lime, and phosphorus, but traces of iron and of gold; as earth, air, and water, and all their constituents, and the finest elements of the stars are there; so, we are beginning to believe, are soul and intellect and spiritual part all representative, in composition, of the highest heavens, the deepest hells, and the nearest, as the farthest, souls, intellects, spirits.

Man being thus a part of every universe, seen or unseen, sensible or unfelt, consciously or unconsciously related, it is certain that he must seek knowledge in each realm through his appropriate part. Physical science gives him knowledge of the material, its substance, laws, forces, and energies; intellect brings him into touch with the intellectual; spiritual senses convey to him the intuitions, not the less true and exact, if rightly apprehended, than science itself—the intuitions of morality and the

fundamental elements of religious and soul life. Each may, perhaps, be expected to aid the other in their common or approximate fields ; but the truest thoughts must come from the truest and most appropriate source. Science cannot teach religion ; creeds can give no aid to science in its formulations of physical law ; intellectual attainments cannot substitute themselves for the moralities. We must always, we may presume, study nature through miscroscope, telescope, test-tube, and spectroscope ; sound logic must always formulate our philosophies ; we must learn to know God through the spiritual powers, no less existent, if less readily perceived and characterized in language, than other human attributes.

The spiritual is as essential to a complete human character as is the intellectual, or the simply moral, or the physical part itself. The unsymmetrical individual may lack this element, just as he may be otherwise defective ; but it is essential to perfection. On the other hand, it may, I think, undoubtedly exist in excess, and in defect, of other qualities. Blind Tom exhibited a marvellous talent, within a limited sphere, for music, though deficient in intellect ; and I can readily conceive a person, or a race, rude and untutored, even in a degree barbarous, but endowed, like God's children in Old-Testament days, with superior religious faculties. Out of the spiritual, we must admit, must come our intuitions, our religious faith. The faculty that we here recognize not only gives power of recognition of religious truths and holds us closer to God, but it is that, also, which gives origin to a necessity in the soul of humanity for settled religious belief. And this necessity is as intense in its manifestation, and as imperative in its compulsion, as any other of the characteristics that sustain the life of the race. It compels all men, all races of men, all ages of humanity and of every race, to seek a formal theory and settled creeds. It is thus that man has been seeking, as a vital element of life, from the first to the latest days, a religion and a creed. And by a creed he usually means a code of absolute truth. What that code shall prove to be he cares not, nor has he a right to care ; but he does and must desire that it shall be a firm foundation for his ethical and devotional life.

As in the field of natural science and in all physical investigation, our books contain the past, our instruments and apparatus contain the future, so, in the higher researches of the philosopher

and the moralist, the books must be searched for the few stray, widely-scattered truths acquired to the time; while in the future lies much still to be gained by man through patient endeavor and the use of men as his instruments, mind as his active agent. In this work nothing can be expected from those "obstinate theorists," as Arago calls them, "who, without being struck by the thousands of instances to the contrary, do yet refuse qualities of the heart to every man whose intellect has been fostered by the fertile and sublime and imperishable truths of the exact sciences." But scientific men must do their part, and their work must be accepted as, so far as it goes, the most stable of all fruits of our study of God's universe and its various worlds, whether tangible or intangible, material, moral, or intellectual. Honesty, fairness, kindness, and good-fellowship must distinguish the attitude of every one who would be successful in such great work.

As Emerson says, "the man of genius must occupy the whole space between God, pure mind, and the multitude of uneducated men. He must draw from the infinite reason on one side; and he must penetrate into the heart and sense of the crowd on the other"; then, with Plato, considering the soul to be immortal, he will "always persevere in the road which leads upward," and, after death, "possess, in the other world, a destiny suited to the life so led in this."

Professors Stewart and Tait, in that remarkable work, "The Unseen Universe," secure what they regard as a "criterion of truth" in the proposition that "God will never permanently put the human race to intellectual confusion." They therefore believe that any real moral or philosophic truth will be recognized by mankind as such; that moral principles, universally recognized as such by the human race, must be accepted as absolute; and that, in proportion as an ethical proposition is generally acknowledged by the most intelligent, its truth may be considered as established. Now, while we may not be able to assert that this foundation principle may be considered as itself absolutely established,—for in the field of morals and the intuitions the whole system of logic and deduction must be based on admitted axioms, incapable of proof,—I think we may at least accept the proposition of Thomson and Tait as the best guide available, out side "revelation," even though it be not itself revelation, as all moral truths are, in a sense.

Let us, for the moment at least, take this principle as our starting-point, and, looking over the religions and the theologies of the past and of the present, endeavor to select from among their many and diverse beliefs those which are the most essential and most unquestionable. In this search for truth we need hardly attempt to follow the course of the great English philosopher whose adventures are described by Bernardin de Saint Pierre, finding truth, at last, in "La Chaumière Indienne"; though we might not unreasonably expect in some sense to repeat his experiment, and, were we to do so, to find little aid among the great philosophers and learned divines; coming nearest to the divinity of Truth, at last even touching the hem of her garments, amid the wilds of the forest and in the humblest dwellings of the earth, among the outcasts and the pariahs, exiled from society, living only with God, and preserving, as the soul cannot amid the rush of the world and its distractions, instincts of right and wrong, always most sure and strong in the bosom of the child and of the childlike.

Truths recognized by the simple and the childlike; those accepted by great masses of people nearest nature, the source; and principles universally admitted by those who are disposed to do right and to kindliness and hospitality—these are most certainly truths and farthest beyond dispute. What pariah and Brahmin alike accept, what Hindoo and European, Cossack and Mexican, equally recognize, may be taken as God's truth, if consonant with the doctrines of the Christ.

But Christ had no formulated creed; his were no rigid statements of the moral law through contrived and circumscribed assertions of limited application. He simply lived a divine life, talked the doctrine of universal love, gave all for love, and died. We may be sure that we need not attempt more than he did. Should we take his ways and follow them faithfully to their end, with no more explicit statement of our belief and doctrine than he gave us, we may be sure we have done all that is required of us.

In the search for truth, the inquirer must necessarily adopt a scientific spirit; and by this I mean he must look for the real, the actual fact, regardless of his prejudices, his earlier prejudgments, his existent belief, or his anticipations, and absolutely unconcerned as to its bearings and its consequences. God's truths can be trusted to stand, and to stand as a whole, each sustaining

every other; and no man need fear that any fact of science, of the seen universe, will contradict or embarrass any other; that any two moral principles will ever conflict; that any ethical logic will lack syllogistic certainty; or that the truths of any one universe will fail to accord with, far less will contradict, any truth in any other of the realms of the Almighty. Every worker helps every other in every field; *all* are needed to secure true knowledge and correct appreciation of the All; no final creed can be reached, accordant with God's trinity, except by the concurrence of workers in every department of the triune. But every laborer in this great field must sacrifice everything to truth. Science supplies facts; but facts of little importance to the seeker after moral truths, except as illustrating the consistencies of God's laws and ways. It gives us methods that are of real value as leading us into the habit of taking knowledge as we may, in half-truths, in incomplete systems, in uncertain nebulous lights, *only provisionally*; always standing ready to sacrifice belief or formulated creed to later revelation; adhering, above all and before everything else, to the latest and fullest truth; taking the nearest right, whatever its form, whatever its consequences, as entitled to all the respect of a revelation.

Scientific truths can never conflict with moral or religious truths. There can be no conflict between science and religion; though there has often been discordance between scientific men and theologians.

We all remember that, when the Argonauts visited the Centaur sage, after Cheiron had welcomed and had feasted them, he sang to them his wondrous song of the battles between the Centaurs and the Lapithai, and their glorious but sad ending:—

"Then Orpheus took the lyre and sang of Chaos, and of the making of this marvellous World, and how *all things sprang from Love, who could not live alone in the Abyss*. And, as he sang, his voice rose from the cave, above the crags, and through the tree-tops, and the glens of oak and pine. And the trees bowed their heads when they heard it, and the gray rocks cracked and rang, and the forest beasts crept near to listen, and the birds forsook their nests and hovered round," and all creation gloried and rejoiced in the magic song.

Full many a child has listened in wonder and has absorbed inspiration from Kingsley's magic stories of the old, the wise

fables of Greek mythology; but what wisest man may not find in this incident, so beautifully told by the old Hellenic troubadours, and translated by that loveliest of modern *repétiteurs*, the simile of grander spiritual events, and an inspiration that, had we Orpheus's heavenly power, should give rise to songs "like voices of angels in Paradise"? I imagine that in our creed, once framed of the scantlings of the creeds of the world and of all the ages, we should find that its study would teach us again "how all things sprang from love" and that "love cannot live alone in the abyss" of this world. In this study we follow Tennyson:—

> "Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control:
> These three alone lead life to sovereign power,
> Yet not for power (power, of herself,
> Would come uncalled for), but to live by law;
> *Acting the law we live by without fear.*"

The *path* only is shown us by our creed; the soul that would follow that path must enter upon it with the right spirit, and pursue it steadily and unhesitatingly, holding the law in reverence; taking its course as the mariner on a long voyage steers by the polestar or the unerring magnetic needle. The guiding-star must be above, and away ahead of us, too, or we shall find ourselves soon far astray. It is this which makes it evident that in olden times, when speculation took the place of research; when fancy, rather than fact, was taken as the guide; when the uncertain meandering of a will-o'-the-wisp, instead of the unchanging polestar, was followed, creeds and lives must have deviated widely from the true course. Had science done nothing more for mankind, its final reconstruction of all our methods of philosophy might be taken as one of the greatest boons ever conferred upon the race.

Absolute independence of belief, and in its expression, is one of the essential elements of progress in religion as in science. I would force my own views upon no one; but I would claim equal privilege in forming my own creeds without interference from others. Others may think as they choose about the inspiration of the Scriptures; but I claim the privilege of concluding that the writer of the decalogue, whether receiving it directly from the Almighty amid the flashing of heavenly flame and the thunders of his voice, in dream, or in the visions of a day—I claim that this

Moses was inspired with the very self of the God that I would demand the right to worship. Let others discuss the question of the humanity or the divinity of Christ as they will. For me there exists the right to follow the dictates of my own reason and feeling, and to assert the conviction that his was a soul essentially divine. Despite the horrors of the old Hebraic theology, it contains much that is, to me, and judged by my standards, unquestionable inspiration ; but how conveyed and how received I would not pretend to say.

I claim the right to do my own thinking so far as to be permitted to believe that inspiration has visited many a good soul in earlier days ; that the human race has never been without the inspiring voice of conscience and the spoken voice of righteous men. I am sure Krishna has always lived, has always had a divine side to his nature ; and Radha has always stood by, with her divine thought, ready to answer his prayer. Independence of thought has formed many creeds; but all on some basis of admitted truth.

Induction only can give certainty ; though it means slow progress. Its operation, however, has resulted in producing very different attitudes in different classes of minds. This process of acquirement of knowledge, practised by one who can only see the physical side of science, leads to the acceptance of agnosticism ; all that is unseen is unfelt, unknown, and unknowable. To those who add to scientific attainments some imagination, who, while seeing the drift of the stars, also hear the music of the spheres, the universe seems to constitute its own deity, creation is its own creator, and pantheism is a satisfying religion, as it was to the earliest Indian philosophers. To those logical minds so constituted as necessarily to recognize a plan and a purpose, the theological view seems to point with certainty to an intellectual first cause, a being in whom omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence, intelligent foresight, and a vast and eternal programme combine to give the infinite creative and preserving and guiding soul all the qualities of a purely intellectual God—a God without sympathies or feelings or compassion or mercy. This is abstract deism. But to those who recognize moral, as well as mental and intellectual and physical, existence and movements ; who feel as well as see ; who are aware of an inner life and an inner consciousness ; who possess that element, essential to all religious life, which we call faith,—meaning

knowledge of moral principles and of all affections coming of instruction through channels never recognized or recognizable through any of the processes of physical science,—the anthropomorphic idea of God is confirmed and attains certainty ; and the complete and symmetrical human soul, with its knowledge coming of scientific research, its faith coming of heaven-implanted intuitions and consciousness, and its reasoning power basing all conclusions on all knowledge,—the anthropomorphic deist,—believes in a personal God who is the ideal and the impersonation of all that the best of men strive toward and hope to approximate, however feebly—infinity of goodness, infinity of love, infinity of charity, all moral excellence, as well as illimitable knowledge and infinite power.

The agnostic learns nothing except what science can teach him ; and his highest thought goes not beyond the mechanism of this organized mass of force-endowed matter, which, only, he can perceive or conceive. The theist "recognizes an omnipresent energy which is none other than the living God," "the infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed," as Mr. Spencer puts it, of which "our lives, alike physical and mental, in common with all the activities, organic and inorganic, amid which we live, are but the workings." The highest conceptions of a Deity are now arising from the study of the development of the universe from primeval chaos ; infinity of expanse enclosing infinitude of germs of all life, of all physical, intellectual, and moral growths, according to a definite plan, and through the operation of law proceeding in an orderly and intelligent scheme toward the perfecting of an unknowable culmination in every realm of physical, intellectual, and moral nature.

With Fiske, "I believe it has been fully shown that, so far from degrading Humanity, or putting it on a level with the animal world in general, the doctrine of evolution shows us distinctly for the first time how the creation and the perfecting of Man is the goal toward which Nature's work has been tending from the first. We can now see clearly that our new knowledge enlarges ten-fold the significance of life, and makes it seem more than ever the chief object of Divine care, the consummate fruition of that creative energy which is manifested throughout the knowable universe. . . . He who regards Man as the consummate fruition of creative energy, and the chief object of Divine care, is almost

irresistibly driven to the belief that the soul's career is not completed with the present life upon the earth."

In that beautiful pagan, yet Christian, poem, so much bepraised, so much abused, "The Light of Asia," Edwin Arnold, in his inimitable rhythm, thus paraphrases the Buddhist's rendering of the teachings of Gautama as to the right way, the "eightfold path which brings to peace":

"The First good Level is Right Doctrine. Walk
In fear of Dharma, shunning all offence;
In heed of Karma, which doth make man's fate;
In lordship over sense.

"The Second is Right Purpose. Have good-will
To all that lives, letting unkindness die
And greed and wrath; so that your lives be made
Like soft airs passing by.

"The Third is Right Discourse. Govern the lips
As they were palace doors, the King within;
Tranquil and fair and courteous be all words
Which from that presence win.

"The Fourth is Right Behavior. Let each act
Assoil a fault or help a merit grow;
Like threads of silver seen through crystal beads
Let love through good deeds show.

"Four higher roadways be. Only those feet
May tread them which have done with earthly things;
Right Purity; Right Thought; Right Loneliness;
Right Rapture. Spread no wings

"For sunward flight, thou soul with unplumed vans!
Sweet is the lower air and safe, and known
The homely levels: only strong ones leave
The nest each makes his own.

. . . . . .

"Enter the path! There spring the healing streams
Quenching all thirst! There bloom th' immortal flowers,
Carpeting all the way with joy! There throng
Swiftest and sweetest hours!"

And so "all who love the Master for his love of us" are taught by this untaught, yet wisest, of pagans to endeavor,

"Living pure, reverent, patient, pitiful,
Loving all things which live even as themselves,"

to pursue the right path toward the right. Thus, nearly five hundred years before the Christian era, a Christ-like pagan para-

phrased the Sermon on the Mount. Why may not we, two thousand years later, with all the teachings of the greater leader before us, with all the accumulated intelligence and moral growth of the intervening period at our command, introduce into our paths and our theories of life and work, and of preparation for life and its work, the perfect principle of the Golden Rule, and all those grand corollaries that have been found to follow, by every earnest disciple of the right, from Gautama and the Christ to our own time? It is such adoption of right principles as has accompanied modern changes and advances in moral and intellectual education that has given us so much progress as we have witnessed in the history of the last century. It is the influence of such elements in our future work that we may trust to give to us all that we are to gain, in the future, for ourselves and for our children, for our fellows, for the nation, and for the world.

We can easily see how it happens that Buddhism survives. Its adherents can grasp, through its teachings, some of the loveliest principles; perceive some of the grandest moral truths; realize something of the truest Christian feeling, simple though such believers are; and thus they gain an experience of the best side of life, even in the midst of their ignorance. Faith, at least, is with them. What Bishop Carpenter calls the essentials of religion, its "permanent elements," dependence, fellowship, progress in moral life, are theirs; but, most of all, Buddha commends to them that quality which our martyred President illustrated with his "malice toward none, with charity for all"—all-comprehending love.

Our modern Plato has said: "There will be a new church founded on moral science; at first cold and naked, a babe in a manger again, the algebra and mathematics of ethical law, the church of men to come, without shawms, or psaltery, or sackbut; but it will have heaven and earth for its beams and rafters; science for symbol and illustration; it will fast enough gather beauty, music, picture, poetry. . . . The nameless Thought, the nameless Power, the super-personal Heart,"—"it shall repose alone on that."

"Our little systems have their day;
They have their day and cease to be:
They are but broken lights of thee,
And Thou, O Lord, art more than they."

Over all, enclosing all, beyond all, and all in all, is love: nobler, diviner, grander than noblest intellect, than grandest beauty of form, than divinest thought. Well may we sing :

> "Strong Son of God, immortal love,
> Whom we, that have not seen thy face,
> By faith, and faith alone, embrace,
> Believing where we cannot prove."

Well may we content ourselves with a creed composed, as to its moral logic, of the Mosaic original ; as to its emotional side, of the Sermon on the Mount ; its whole, the "new commandment," "that ye love one another"! Such a creed satisfies the reason and conscience through the decalogue, the spirit through Christ, the whole soul through love ; while the Lord's prayer expresses every essential aspiration.

Christ crucified is the incarnation and the apotheosis of God's charity—"the dewdrop lost in the shining sea" of infinite love. While faith gives us firm hold on all that the soul prizes, what more do we need ? what more should we desire ? why vex ourselves with minor and perhaps unsolvable questions ? And for the one promise—"Blessed are the *pure in heart*, for they shall see God." That is all ; that is enough !

How much of this essential creed is comprehended in that beautiful verse of Lowell !—

> "All round about our feet shall shine
> A light like that the wise men saw,
> If we our loving wills incline
> To that sweet life which is the Law."

ROBERT H. THURSTON.

THE STATE AS AN IMMORAL TEACHER.

BY OUIDA.

THE tendency of the last years of the nineteenth century is toward increase in the powers of the state and decrease in the powers of the individual citizen. Whether the government of a country be at this moment nominally free, or whether it be avowedly despotic, whether it be an empire, a republic, a constitutional monarchy, or a self-governing and neutralized principality, the actual government is a substitution of state machinery for individual choice and individual liberty. In Servia, in Bulgaria, in France, in Germany, in England, in America, in Australia, anywhere you will, the outward forms of government differ widely, but beneath all there is the same interference of the state with personal volition, the same obligation for the individual to accept the dictum of the state in lieu of his own judgment. The only difference is that such a pretension is natural and excusable in an autocracy: in a constitutional or republican state it is an anomaly, even an absurdity. But whether it be considered admirable or accursed, the fact is conspicuous that every year adds to the pretensions and powers of the state, and every year diminishes the personal freedom of the man.

To whatever the fact be traceable, it is there; and it is probably due to the increase of a purely *doctrinaire* education, which with itself increases the number of persons who look upon humanity as a drill-sergeant looks upon battalions of conscripts: the battalions must learn to move mechanically in masses, and no single unit of them must be allowed to murmur or to fall out of the ranks. That this conscript or that may be in torture all the while matters nothing whatever to the drill-sergeant. That what would have been an excellent citizen makes a rebellious or inefficient conscript is not his business either: he only requires a battalion which moves with mechanical precision. The state is but a drill-sergeant on a large scale, with a whole nationality marched out on the parade-ground.

Whatever were in other respects the evils attendant on other ages than this, those ages were favorable to the development of individuality, and therefore of genius. The present age is opposed to such development; and the more the state manipulates the man, the more completely will individuality and originality be destroyed. The state requires a military machine in which there is no hitch, an exchequer in which there is never a deficit, and a public monotonous, obedient, colorless, spiritless, moving unanimously and humbly like a flock of sheep along a straight high road between two walls. That is the ideal of every bureaucracy; and what is the state except a crystallized bureaucracy? It is the habit of those who uphold the despotism of government to speak as though it were some impersonal entity, some unerring guide, some half-divine thing like the pillar of fire which the Israelites imagined conducted them in their exodus. In actual fact, the state is only the executive; representing the momentary decisions of a majority which is not even at all times a genuine majority, but is in frequent cases a fabricated and fictitious preponderance, artificially and arbitrarily produced. There can be nothing noble, sacred, or unerring in such a majority: it is fallible and fallacious; it may be in the right, it may be in the wrong; it may light by accident on wisdom, or it may plunge by panic into folly. There is nothing in its origin or its construction which can render it imposing in the sight of an intelligent and high-spirited man. But the mass of men are not intelligent and not high-spirited, and so the incubus which lies on them through it they support as the camel his burden, sweating beneath it at every pore. The state is the empty cap of Gessler, to which all but Tell consent to bow.

It has been made a reproach to the centuries preceding this one that in them privilege occupied the place of law; but, though privilege was capricious and often unjust, it was always elastic, sometimes benignant: law—civil law, such as the state frames and enforces—is never elastic and is never benignant. It is an engine which rolls on its own iron lines, and crushes what it finds opposed to it, without any regard to the excellence of what it may destroy.

The nation, like the child, becomes either brutalized by overdrilling or emasculated by having all its actions and opinions continually prescribed for it. It is to be doubted whether any

precautions or any system could compass what the state in many countries is now endeavoring to do, by regulation and prohibition, to prevent the spread of infectious maladies. But it is certain that the nervous terrors inspired by state laws and by-laws beget a malady of the mind more injurious than the bodily ills which so absorb the state. Whether Pasteur's inoculation for rabies be a curse or a boon to mankind, there can be no question that the exaggerated ideas which it creates, the fictitious importance which it lends to what was previously a most rare malady, the nightmare horrors it invokes, and the lies which its propagandists, to justify its pretences, find themselves compelled to invent, produce a dementia and hysteria in the public mind which is a disease far more widespread and dangerous than mere rabies (unassisted by science and government) could ever have become.

The dissemination of cowardice is a greater evil than would be the increase of any physical ill whatever. To direct the minds of men in nervous terror to their own bodies is to make of them a trembling and shivering pack of prostrate poltroons. The microbe may or may not exist; but the nervous terrors generated in the microbe's name are worse evils than any bacillus. It is the physiologist's trade to increase these terrors; he lives by them, and by them alone has his being; but when the state takes his crotchets and quackeries in earnest and forces them upon the public as law, the effect is physically and mentally disastrous. The cholera as a disease is bad enough; but worse than itself by far are the brutal egotism, the palsied terror, the convulsive agonies, with which it is met and which the state in all countries does so much to increase. Fear alone kills five-tenths of its victims, and during its latest visitation in the streets of Naples people would spring up from their seats, shriek that they had cholera, and fall dead in convulsions caused by sheer panic, whilst in many country places the villagers fired on railway trains which they imagined might carry the dreaded malady amongst them. This kind of panic cannot be entirely controlled by any state, but it might be mitigated by judicious moderation, instead of being, as it is, intensified and hounded on by the press, the physiologists, and the governments all over the known world.

The state has already passed its cold, hard, iron-plated arms between the parent and the offspring, and is daily dragging and forcing them asunder. The old moral law may say, "Honor

your father and mother," etc., etc., but the state says, on the contrary: "Leave your mother ill and untended whilst you attend to your own education; and summon your father to be fined and imprisoned if he dare lay a hand on you when you disgrace and deride him." The other day a workingman in London was sentenced to a fortnight's imprisonment with hard labor, because, being justly angry with his little girl for disobeying his orders and staying out night after night in the streets, he struck her twice with a leathern strap, and she was "slightly bruised." The man asked pertinently what was the world coming to if a parent might not correct his child as he thought fit. What can be the relations of this father and daughter when he leaves the prison to which she sent him? What authority can he have in her sight? What obedience will he be able to exact from her? The bruises from the strap would soon pass away, but the rupture, by the sentence of the tribunal, of parental and filial ties can never be healed. The moral injury done to the girl by this interference of the state is irreparable, ineffaceable. The state has practically told her that disobedience is no offence, and has allowed her to be the accuser and jailer of one who, by another canon of law, is said to be set in authority over her both by God and man.

The moral and the civil law alone decree and enforce the inviolability of property: anything which is the property of another, be it but of the value of a copper coin, cannot be taken by you without your becoming liable to punishment as a thief. This, by the general consent of mankind, has been esteemed correct, just, and necessary. But the state breaks this law, derides it, rides rough-shod over it, when for its own purposes it requires the property of a private person: it calls the process by various names—condemnation, expropriation, annexation, etc.; but it is seizure, violent seizure, and essentially seizure against the owner's will. If a man enter your kitchen-garden and take a few onions or a few potatoes, you can seize, prosecute, and imprison him: the state takes the whole garden, and turns you out of it, and turns it into anything else which for the moment seems to the state excellent or advantageous, and against the impersonal robber you can do naught. The state considers it compensation enough to pay an arbitrary value; but not only are there many possessions, notably in land, for the loss of which no equivalent could reconcile us, but the state herein sets up a

principle which is never accorded in law. If the man who steals the onions offers to pay their value, he is not allowed to do so, nor is the owner of the onions allowed to accept such compensation: it is called "compounding a felony." The state alone may commit this felony with impunity.

The state continually tampers with and tramples on private property, taking for itself what and where and how it pleases: the example given to the public is profoundly immoral. The plea put forth in excuse for its action by the state is that of public benefit: the interests of the public cannot, it avers, be sacrificed to private interest or ownership or rights of any sort. But herein it sets up a dangerous precedent. The man who steals the potatoes might argue in his own justification that it is better in the interest of the public that one person should lose a few potatoes than that another person should starve for want of them, and so either in prison or in poorhouse become chargeable to the nation. If private rights and the sacredness of property can be set at naught by the state for its own purposes, they cannot be logically held to be sacred in its courts of law for any individual. The state claims immunity for theft on the score of convenience: so then may the individual.

If the civil law be in conflict with and contradiction of religious law, as has been shown elsewhere,* it is none the less in perpetual opposition to moral law and to all the finer and more generous instincts of the human soul. It preaches egotism as the first duty of man, and studiously inculcates cowardice as the highest wisdom. In its strenuous endeavor to cure physical ills it does not heed what infamies it may sow broadcast in the spiritual fields of the mind and heart. It treats altruism as criminal when altruism means indifference to the contagion of any infectious malady. The precautions enjoined in any such malady, stripped bare of their pretences, really mean the naked selfishness of the *sauve qui peut.* The pole-axe used on the herd which has been in contact with another herd infected by pleuro-pneumonia or anthrax would be used on the human herd suffering from typhoid, or small-pox, or yellow-fever, or diphtheria, if the state had the courage to follow out its own teachings to their logical conclusions. Who shall say that it will not be so used

*See article "Has Christianity Failed?"—NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, February, 1891.

some day in the future, when increase of population shall have made mere numbers of trifling account, and the terrors excited by physiologists of ungovernable force ?

We have gained little by the emancipation of human society from the tyranny of the churches if in its stead we substitute the tyranny of the state. One may as well be burned at the stake as compelled to submit to the prophylactic of Pasteur or the lymph of Koch. When once we admit that the law should compel vaccination for small pox, there is no logical reason for refusing to admit that the law shall enforce any infusion or inoculation which its chemical and medical advisers may suggest to it.

On the first of May, 1890, a French surgeon, M. Lannelongue, had a little imbecile child in his hospital; he fancied that he should like to try trepanning on the child as a cure for imbecility. In the words of the report :

"Il taillait la suture sagittale et parallèlement avec elle une longue et étroite incision cranienne depuis la suture frontale à la suture occipitale; il en resulta pour la partie osseusse une perte de substance longue de 9 centimetres et large de 6 millimetres, et il en resulta pour le cerveau un véritable débridement."

If this child live, and be no longer imbecile, the parents of all idiots will presumably be compelled by law to submit their children to this operation of trepanning and excision. Such a law would be the only logical issue of existing hygienic laws.

In the battlefield the state requires from its sons the most unflinching fortitude ; but in civil life it allows them, even bids them, to be unblushing poltroons.

An officer, being sent out by the English War Office this year to fill a distinguished post in Hong Kong, was ordered to be vaccinated before going to it; and the vaccination was made a condition of the appointment. In this instance a man thirty years old was thought worthy of confidence and employment by the state, but such a fool or babe in his own affairs that he could not be trusted to look after his own health. You cannot make a human character fearful and nervous, and then call upon it for the highest qualities of resolve, of capacity, and of courage. You cannot coerce and torment a man, and then expect from him intrepidity, presence of mind, and ready invention in perilous moments.

A few years ago nobody thought it a matter of the slightest consequence to be bitten by a healthy dog; as a veterinary surgeon has justly said, a scratch from a rusty nail or the jagged tin of a sardine-box is much more truly dangerous than a dog's tooth. Yet in the last five years the physiologists and the state, which in all countries protects them, have succeeded in so inoculating the public mind with senseless terrors that even the accidental touch of a puppy's lips or the kindly lick of his tongue throws thousands of people into an insanity of fear. Dr. Bell has justly said: "Pasteur does not cure rabies: he creates it." In like manner the state does not cure either folly or fear: it creates both.

The state is the enemy of all volition in the individual: hence it is the enemy of all manliness, of all force, of all independence, and of all originality. The exigencies of the state, from its monstrous taxation to its irritating by-laws, are in continual antagonism with all those who have character uncowed and vision unobscured. Under the terrorizing generic term of law, the state cunningly, and for its own purposes, confounds its own petty regulations and fiscal exactions with the genuine solemnity of moral and criminal laws. The latter any man who is not a criminal will feel bound to respect; the former no man who has an opinion and courage of his own will care to observe. Trumpery police and municipal regulations are merged by the ingenuity of the state into a nominal identity with genuine law; and for all its purposes, whether of social tyranny or of fiscal extortion, the union is to the state as useful as it is fictitious. The state has everywhere discovered that it is lucrative and imposing to worry and fleece the honest citizen; and everywhere it shapes its civil code, therefore, mercilessly and cunningly towards this end.

Under the incessant meddling of government and its offspring, bureaucracy, the man becomes poor of spirit and helpless. He is like a child who, never being permitted to have its own way, has no knowledge of taking care of itself or of avoiding accidents. As, here and there, a child is of rare and strong enough stuff to break his leading-strings, and grows, when recaptured, dogged and sullen, so are there men who resist the dogma and dictation of the state, and when coerced and chastised become rebels to its rules. The petty tyrannies of the state gall and fret them at every step; and the citizen who is law-abiding, so far as the greater moral code is concerned, is stung and whipped

into continual contumacy by the impertinent interference of the civil code with his daily life.

Why should a man fill up a census-return, declare his income to a tax-gatherer, muzzle his dog, send his children to schools he disapproves, ask permission of the state to marry, or do perpetually what he dislikes or condemns, because the state wishes him to do these things? When a man is a criminal, the state has a right to lay hands on him; but whilst he is innocent of all crime his opinions and his objections should be respected. There may be many reasons—harmless or excellent reasons—why publicity about his life is offensive or injurious to him: what right has the state to pry into his privacy and force him to write its details in staring letters for all who run to read? The state only teaches him to lie.

"You ask me things that I have no right to tell you," replied Jeanne d'Arc to her judges. So may the innocent man, tormented by the state, reply to the state, which has no business with his private life until he has made it forfeit by a crime.

The moment that the state leaves the broad lines of public affairs to meddle with the private interests and actions of its people, it is compelled to enlist in its service spies and informers. Without these it cannot make up its long lists of transgressions; it cannot know whom to summon and what to prosecute.

That duplicity which is in the Italian character, so universally ingrained there that the noblest natures are tainted by it,—a duplicity which makes entire confidence impossible, and secrecy an instinct strong as life,—can be philosophically trained to the influences which the constant dread of the *sbirri* and *spiè* employed under their various governments for so many centuries has left upon their national temperament. Dissimulation, so long made necessary, has become part and parcel of the essence of their being. Such secretiveness is the inevitable product of domestic espionage and trivial interference from the state, as the imposition of a gate-tax makes the peasantry who pass the gate ingenious in concealment and in subterfuge.

The requisitions and regulations of the state dress themselves vainly in the pomp of law; they set themselves up side by side with moral law; but they are not it, and cannot possess its impressiveness. Even a thief will acknowledge that "Thou shalt not steal" is a just and solemn commandment; but that to carry

across a frontier, without declaring it, a roll of tobacco (which you honestly bought, and which is strictly your own) is also a heinous crime, both common-sense and conscience refuse to admit. The Irish peasant could never be brought to see why the private illicit whiskey-still was illicit, and as such was condemned and destroyed, and the convictions which followed its destruction were amongst the bitterest causes of Irish disaffection. A man caught in the act of taking his neighbor's goods knows that his punishment is deserved; but a man punished for using or enjoying his own is filled with chafing rage against the injustice of his lot. Between a moral law and a fiscal or municipal or communal imposition or decree, there is as much difference as there is between a living body and a galvanized corpse. When in a great war a nation is urged by high appeal to sacrifice its last ounce of gold, its last shred of treasure, to save the country, the response is willingly made from patriotism; but when the revenue officer and the tax-gatherer demand, threaten, fine, and seize, the contributor can only feel the irritating impoverishment of such a process, and yields his purse reluctantly. Electoral rights are considered to give him a compensating share in the control of public expenditure; but this is mere fiction: he may disapprove in every item the expenditure of the state; he cannot alter it.

Tolstoï has constantly affirmed that there is no necessity for any government anywhere: it is not *a* government, but *all* governments, on which he wages war. He considers that all are alike corrupt, tyrannical, and opposed to a fine and free ideal of life. It is certain that they are not "the control of the fittest" in any actual sense, for the whole aspect of public life tends every year more and more to alienate from it those whose capacity and character are higher than those of their fellows: it becomes more and more a routine, an *engrenage*, a trade.

From a military, as from a financial, point of view this result is of advantage to the government, whether it be imperial or republican; but it is hostile to the character of a nation, morally and æsthetically. In its best aspect, the state is like a parent who seeks to play Providence to his offspring, to foresee and ward off all accident and all evil, and to provide for all possible contingencies, bad and good. As the parent inevitably fails in doing this, so the state fails, and must fail, in such a task.

Strikes, with their concomitant evils, are only another form of tyranny; but they have this good in them—that they are opposed to the tyranny of the state, and tend to lessen it by the unpleasant shock which they give to its self-conceit and self-complacency. Trades-unions turn to their own purposes the lesson which the state has taught them—*i. e.*, a brutal sacrifice of individual will and welfare to a despotic majority.

There is more or less truth and justification in all revolutions because they are protests against bureaucracy. When they are successful, they abjure their own origin and become in their turn the bureaucratic tyranny, sometimes modified, sometimes exaggerated, but always tending towards reproduction of that which they destroyed. And the bureaucratic influence is always immoral and unwholesome, were it only in the impatience which it excites in all courageous men and the apathy to which it reduces all those who are without courage. Its manifold and emasculating commands are to all real strength as the cords in which Gulliver was bound by the pygmies.

The state only aims at instilling those qualities in its public by which its demands are obeyed and its exchequer is filled. Its highest attainment is the reduction of mankind to clockwork. In its atmosphere all those finer and more delicate liberties which require liberal treatment and spacious expansion inevitably dry up and perish. Take a homely instance. A poor, hard-working family found a little stray dog; they took it in, sheltered, fed it, and attached themselves to it; it was in one of the streets of London; the police after a time summoned them for keeping a dog without a license; the woman, who was a widow, pleaded that she had taken it out of pity, that they had tried to lose it, but that it always came back to them; she was ordered to pay the amount of the dog-tax and two guineas' costs; *i. e.*, the state said to her: "Charity is the costliest of indulgencies; you are poor; you have no right to be humane." The lesson given by the state was the vilest and meanest which could be given. This woman's children, growing up, will remember that she was ruined for being kind; they will harden their hearts, in accordance with the lesson; if they become brutal to animals and men, it is the state which will have made them so.

All the state's edicts in all countries inculcate similar egotism; generosity is in its sight a lawless and unlawful thing: it is so

busied in urging the use of disinfectants and ordering the destruction of buildings and of beasts, the exile of families and the closing of drains, that it never sees the logical issue of its injunctions, which is to leave the sick man alone and flee from his infected vicinity: it is so intent on insisting on the value of state education that it never perceives that it is enjoining on the child to advance itself at any cost and leave its procreators in their hovel. The virtues of self-sacrifice, of disinterested affection, of humanity, of self-effacement, are nothing to it; by its own form of organism it is debarred from even admiring them; they come in its way; they obstruct it; it destroys them.

Mr. Ruskin, in one of the papers of his *Fors Clavigera*, speaks of an acacia tree, young and beautiful, green as acacias only are green in Venice, where no dust ever is; it grew beside the water steps of the Academy of the Arts and was a morning and evening joy to him. One day he found a man belonging to the municipality cutting it down root and branch. "Why do you murder that tree?" he asked. The man replied "*Per far pulizia*" (to clean the place). The acacia and the municipality of Venice are an allegory of the human soul and its controller, the state. The acacia was a thing of grace and verdure, a sunrise and sunset pleasure to a great soul; it had fragrance in its white blossoms and shade in its fair branches; it fitly accompanied the steps which lead to the feasts of Carpaccio and the pageants of Gian. Bellini. But in the sight of the Venetian municipality it was irregular and unclean. So are all the graces and greenness of the human soul to the state, which merely requires a community tax-paying, decree-obeying, uniform, passionless, enduring as the ass, meek as the lamb, with neither will nor wishes; a featureless humanity practising the goose-step in eternal routine and obedience.

When the man has become a passive creature, with no will of his own, taking the military yoke unquestioningly, assigning his property, educating his family, holding his tenures, ordering his daily life, in strict accord with the regulations of the state, he will have his spirit and his individuality annihilated, and he will, in compensation to himself, be brutal to all those over whom he has power. The cowed conscript of Prussia becomes the hectoring bully of Alsace.*

* Whoever may care to study the brutal treatment of conscripts and soldiers in Germany by their officers is referred to the revelations published this year by Kurt Abel and Captain Miller, both eye-witnesses of these tortures.

"*Libera chiesa in libero stato*" is the favorite stock phrase of Italian politicians; but it is an untruth—nay, an impossibility—not only in Italy, but in the whole world. The church cannot be liberal because liberality stultifies itself; the state cannot be liberal because its whole existence is bound up with dominion. In all the political schemes which exist now, working themselves out in actuality, or proposed as a panacea to the world, there is no true liberality; there is only a choice between despotism and anarchy. In religious institutions it is the same: they are all egotisms in disguise. Socialism wants what it calls equality; but its idea of equality is to cut down all tall trees that the brushwood may not feel itself overtopped. Plutocracy, like its almost extinct predecessor, aristocracy, wishes, on the other hand, to keep all the brushwood low, so that it may grow above it at its own pace and liking. Which is the better of the two?

Civil liberty is the first quality of a truly free life; and in the present age the tendency of the state is everywhere to admit this in theory, but to deny it in practice. To be able to go through the comedy of the voting-urn is considered privilege enough to atone for the loss of civil and moral freedom in all other things. If it be true that a nation has the government which it deserves to have, then the merits of all the nations are small indeed. With some the state assumes the guise of a police officer, and in others of a cuirassier, and in others of an attorney; but in all it is a despot issuing its petty laws with the pomp of Jove; thrusting its truncheon, or its sword, or its quill into the heart of domestic life, and breaking the backbone of the man who has spirit enough to resist it. The views of the state are like those of the Venetian municipality concerning the acacia. Its one aim is a methodical, monotonous, mathematically-measured regularity: it admits of no expansion; it tolerates no exceptions; of beauty it has no consciousness; of any range beyond that covered by its own vision it is ignorant. It may work on a large scale,—even on an enormous scale,—but it cannot work on a great one. Greatness can be the offspring alone of volition and of genius: it is everywhere the continual effort of the state to coerce the one and to suffocate the other.

OUIDA.

PENSIONS AND PATRIOTISM.

BY THE HON. GREEN B. RAUM, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS.

THE attention of the country has been particularly attracted to the subject of pensions by the passage by Congress last year of the law known as the "Disability Bill" and the expenditure of $106,000,000 for pensions. The fact that more than 600,000 claims have been filed under this recent law, and the further fact that the expenditures for pensions will be materially increased, have provoked a discussion upon the general subject of pensions not at all complimentary to the legislators who passed the laws or to the old soldiers who become the beneficiaries.

It is alleged that already unjust and unnecessary taxation is maintained to meet these expenditures, which are likely to be swelled to an annual outlay of $200,000,000. The wisdom and justice of the whole system of pension legislation seem to be seriously called into question.

All civilized nations have for centuries granted pensions in some form to the soldiers who fought in their great wars. The United States has followed the example of other nations, and has granted pensions, and passed other beneficial laws, for the soldiers who have fought in all the wars from 1775 to the present time, and the widows, orphans, and dependent parents of deceased soldiers have been made beneficiaries of this legislation. Pensions were first granted for wounds and other disabilities incurred in the service and in line of duty. But little opposition has ever been manifested to the passage of laws granting pensions to this class of persons. The next step has been, after the lapse of years, to grant a service pension to the survivors of a war. This was done for the survivors of the Revolutionary War, of the War of 1812, and of the Mexican War. The law of 1887 granting a service pension to the surviving veterans of the

Mexican War received the approval of the country, as an act of justice to a class of patriotic citizens who had performed honorable service and who were then in the decline of life.

Prior to the War for the Union a favorite plan for the recognition of the value of the services of our citizen soldiery was to make them grants from the public lands. To the soldiers of the War of 1812 and of the Mexican War were granted land warrants amounting to 63,500,000 acres, being 2,000,000 greater than the area of Illinois and Ohio.

This long line of legislative precedents has a profound meaning. It emphasizes the fact that the noblest duty a man can perform is to risk his life for his country; that a soldier who incurs the hardships and dangers of war does so not only to protect his own doorsill but that of all the citizens of the republic; that the paltry dollars which a soldier receives as monthly pay for his military service in time of war cannot be considered a suitable equivalent for his patriotic services; and that an equitable obligation arises on the part of the government to make suitable provision for the men who have fought under the national flag, and for their widows, orphans, and dependent parents.

It is said that this obligation does not rest in contract. Be it so. It is, however, an obligation which rests upon principles and sentiments quite as binding upon the heart and conscience of the nation as a written contract signed and sealed.

When a nation goes to war, its very existence is involved. The outcome of the struggle depends upon the number of soldiers that can be rallied under the flag, and therefore upon the patriotism of the people. It is essential to the safety of every country that this spirit of patriotism shall be encouraged and fostered so as to maintain a willingness on the part of the people to spring to the defence of the country in time of danger. This spirit is regarded with us as a greater bulwark for public defence than a large standing army. In all countries the highest honor is accorded to the men who fight the battles of their country.

There seem to be three well-defined grounds upon which pension laws and other beneficial legislation for soldiers rest: first, to stimulate the spirit of patriotism in the people by recognizing and honoring the love of country exhibited by the soldiers; second, a recognition that the monthly pay of the soldier was not a suitable equivalent for the services rendered; third, a broad sen-

timent of gratitude upon the part of the people to men who have died in defence of their country and to those who have risked health and life under the flag.

Let no one make the mistake of concluding that all this legislation by Congress and by State legislatures for the benefit of the men who served their country during the war, and of their widows and orphans, is prompted simply by a spirit of almsgiving It was not this spirit which inspired the erection of the numerous soldiers' homes throughout the country, where thousands of disabled veterans receive care and treatment, and the establishment of national cemeteries for the repose of heroic dust; nor was this the moving cause for the enactment of the various pension laws now upon the statute-book. These acts were prompted by patriotism, justice, and gratitude—to bestow benefactions on the living, benedictions on the dead.

Earnest objection has been made in some quarters to the act of June 27, 1890, known as the Disability Pension Law. This act is a broad departure from the principle of other laws granting pensions for disabilities. All the other laws restrict pensions to persons who incurred wounds and disabilities in the service and in line of duty, and to the widows and orphans or dependent parents of such persons. The incurrence of the disability in the service was the central fact in a claim, and the burden of proving this fact devolved upon the claimant.

The administration of the pension laws for twenty-five years developed the fact that hundreds of thousands of old soldiers who had served faithfully were now, and had been for years, seriously. disabled, but could not furnish the proof to show that their disabilities were of service origin. That they had followed the flag for four years and had never missed a battle, and were now seriously disabled, was not enough to warrant the granting of a pension. They were required to show that they had suffered from some injury or disease in the service to which the present disability could rightfully be attributed.

Observation and experience had demonstrated that military service, with its exposures, fatigues, and excitements, was a potent cause in destroying health and breaking down constitutions. When the services rendered in the great campaigns of the late war are recalled, it is not to be wondered at that the health and strength of the men were broken down.

Let us glance for a moment at the career of the Army of the Tennessee, composed of the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Corps, as an illustration. The regiments of this army were mostly organized in 1861 and 1862. Some of them were in all the great battles of the western army. They were in Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. They were at Belmont, Fort Henry, Donelson, Shiloh, the siege of Corinth, Iuka, the battle of Corinth, and Hatchee. They penetrated central Mississippi in the winter of 1862. They went down the Yazoo Pass in the spring of 1863. They crossed the Mississippi River below Vicksburg on May 1, 1863, and in twenty-two days had fought five battles, had laid siege to Vicksburg, and had assaulted the works. Failing in their attempt to capture the works by assault, they besieged the place until it surrendered on July 4, 1863. They immediately marched upon Jackson and dispersed General Johnston's army. They went by steamboat to Memphis, thence marched 300 miles to the relief of Chattanooga, and fought at Missionary Ridge. They immediately marched to the relief of Knoxville. They captured Meridian and destroyed its railroads. They were in the campaign against Atlanta; were one hundred days under fire and fought in its battles. They alone fought and defeated Hood's army July 22, when McPherson fell. They held Allatoona Pass and Resaca against Hood. They were on the great March to the Sea, fought at Griswoldville, and captured Fort McAllister. They entered Savannah about Christmas and rested three weeks. On January 16, 1865, they started on their last campaign through the Carolinas. It was winter. The first day they encountered a tremendous storm, which caused the greatest flood in the Savannah River in fifty years. Their camps were necessarily pitched in mud and water. The roads were almost impassable. They swam or bridged swollen streams; they overcame every impediment; they fought battles and drove the enemy before them, and finally witnessed the surrender of the rebel army under General Johnston.

They had first met this able general at Jackson, Miss., then in Georgia, and now, for the last time, in North Carolina. These men marched through Virginia and were in the great review at Washington. They fought under Grant, Sherman, McPherson, Logan, Howard, Dodge, Blair, and a host of able division and

brigade commanders. Thousands of these men never crossed the threshold of a hospital, and yet but few of them who carried muskets are now able to undergo the fatigues of manual labor. It is not to be believed by intelligent men and women that the soldiers who endured these hardships and dangers came out of the service with unimpaired vitality.

The services of this army are a specimen of the services of all the armies. These mighty services were performed under the influence of a patriotic elation which wrought up the will and made nerves of steel; but when their labors were ended a reaction came, and with it that multitude of incurable ailments which have baffled the skill of the most learned physicians of the land.

Nearly all the great leaders in the war have died before their time, and the rank and file of the army are dropping off more rapidly than their neighbors of the same age. More than two out of seven of the survivors of the war have already died. A careful examination of the vital statistics of survivors of the late war has led to the conclusion that probably 600,000 of them were so impaired in health that they have lost at least twelve years of the usual expectation of life. The fact that hundreds of thousands of the survivors are poor, and unable to perform manual labor because of physical disabilities, is so well attested that it will not admit of dispute. The ranks of the army were filled by men who before their enlistment and after their discharge earned their living by labor. Good health was a prime factor with them in their struggle for subsistence. When that failed them, their capital was gone. They found that where the physical condition of a man is such that he cannot perform a full day's labor it is difficult for him to obtain employment. The procession of able-bodied men passed on and secured the best places, while these dropped behind and were compelled to accept such employment as they could get. This was the experience of thousands of old soldiers who in the days of their strength performed heroic service for the country.

All the facts in the case were duly considered by the last Congress, and it came to the relief of this deserving class of men and enacted the law of June 27, 1890, known as the Disability Pension Act. This law grants a pension of not less than $6 nor more than $12 per month to all honorably-discharged soldiers who served ninety days or more, and who are suffering from a

mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which incapacitates them for the performance of manual labor in such degree as to render them unable to earn a support. It also grants a pension of $8 per month to the widows of deceased soldiers who are without other means of support than their daily labor, and $2 each per month to the children of soldiers under sixteen years of age. Pensions granted under this act begin with the date of filing the applications.

The execution of this law will no doubt dispose of a great mass of claims, filed under former laws, which have been pending for years. The allowance of claims under the rates fixed by this law has already reduced the average first payments on pension certificates from $485, the average of last year, to about $120, and the average monthly allowance to claimants now is less than $9.

The total payments for pensions this year will be about $116,000,000, being about $9,000,000 less than was estimated and appropriated for by Congress. The appropriation for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1891, is $127,670,793.89. This amount is believed to be sufficient for the next fiscal year. Taking into account the number of pensioners who will be dropped from the rolls by death and other causes, it is believed that 250,000 new pensions can be granted next year without creating a deficiency in the appropriation. It is also believed that the maximum number of names will be placed on the pension rolls during the fiscal year 1893 ; that the maximum annual expenditure for pensions will be made during that year, and that the amount will not reach $150,000,000. From that time forward there will be a reduction in the expenditure for pensions.

No fears need be entertained that it will be necessary to levy new taxes for the payment of pensions. All war taxes have been removed save those now levied through the internal-revenue office. Last year these taxes provided ample funds to pay the pensions and the interest on the national debt. These war taxes will suffice at all times to meet the necessary appropriations for existing pension legislation.

The men who fought to save the Union were not mercenaries. They did not preserve this country for the purpose of looting its treasury. They are to-day as earnestly devoted to the interests and prosperity of the country as they were from 1861 to 1865.

They have no desire to see burdensome pension legislation which will require the levying of unjust and unnecessary taxation, and, above all, they do not propose by any action on their part to withdraw from the sympathetic touch of that body of their fellow-citizens who witnessed the great struggle for the Union, or of that generation of people who have come upon the stage of action since the war. They know that their services during the war merited the respect of their fellow-citizens, and by no act of theirs will they forfeit that respect while life lasts.

Thousands of these men ask for no pensions for themselves, but they do ask that their deserving comrades who are disabled shall have from the country a generous recognition of their services. They feel that an old soldier can receive a pension as a recognition of honorable service with a feeling of pride, while he would turn his back with shame upon an offer of charity.

One hundred years have elapsed since the Revolution, and we see a patriotic awakening among the descendants of the soldiers of that period in the organization of societies of Sons and Daughters of the Revolution. The respect of the American people for the men of '76 has not died out, and the descendants of those heroes trace with reverence and pride the record of the services of their ancestors in the pension office. Will the descendants of the heroes of the War for the Union one hundred years hence fail to exhibit an equal pride in the history of the services of their grandfathers? Methinks, as the time approaches for the celebration of the centennial of Appomattox, millions of people will proudly trace their lineage from those who served in that great war, and will venerate their ancestors' names all the more because they were pensioned for their honorable services.

The Bureau of Pensions is no doubt the largest executive bureau in the world. The office force consists of 2,009 persons, besides eighteen pension agents, with a clerical force of 419, and 3,795 examining surgeons stationed in various parts of the country; being a total force of 6,241. The force of the bureau is organized into fifteen divisions. Five of these divisions, with 1,391 clerks, adjudicate all claims, which are in turn reviewed by the board of review, with a force of 166 persons. These divisions pass upon the sufficiency of the evidence for the establishment of claims, while the medical division, with a force of 160 persons, decides all medical questions reported by boards of

medical examiners, and fixes the degree of disability upon which the rate of pension is based. All claims are carefully briefed, and the action of the several divisions is noted upon the face of the brief.

No original claim is allowed without the action of the examiner in the adjudicating division and of a reviewer and re-reviewer in the board of review; and the action of these persons is under the constant supervision of the chiefs and assistant chiefs of their divisions. The adjudicating divisions are under the immediate direction of the two deputy commissioners, and the board of review and the medical division are under the immediate direction of the Commissioner, while the entire business of the bureau is, in turn, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, assisted by one of his assistant secretaries, with a board of appeals in the department for the reëxamination of cases appealed from the decision of the Commissioner. The whole business of the office is conducted according to well-established rules.

At this writing (June 13) there are 119,815 cases which have been drawn from the files and are in the hands of the various divisions undergoing necessary action for their adjudication and allowance, while there are 28,023 cases which have been allowed and are in process of having certificates written and forwarded for payment. This great movement of cases is kept up, so that at this time there are 30,000 cases per month allowed. Calls for evidence are made in 85,000 cases per month, and orders for medical examinations in 45,000 cases. When cases are completed and notice is given, they are immediately withdrawn from the files for adjudication. The average monthly mail of the office is 600,000 pieces, each of which is duly acknowledged.

There are now pending 168,975 soldiers' and 93,949 widows' original claims under the old laws; 135,611 of these soldiers and 73,982 of these widows have filed claims under the Disability Bill in connection with the above claims. There are 300,810 claims for increase of pensions pending; 179,214 soldiers' and 59,960 widows' original claims pending under the Disability Bill; also 77,180 claims in cases where pensions have been granted under other laws; and there are 5,418 claims based on military service prior to 1861. The total number of claims pending is 1,095,099. The actual number of original claimants who have not been pensioned is: soldiers, 348,189; widows, 153,909; old war, 5,418; total,

507,516. All other claims are for increase of pensions already granted or duplicate claims under other laws.

It is estimated that 1,208,707 soldiers of the Union are now living, and that 1,004,658 soldiers were killed in battle and died during and since the war. Of these survivors 478,356 are now on the pension rolls, and 120,522 widows and dependents are on the rolls. So it appears that 730,451 survivors are not pensioned, and 884,136 deceased soldiers are not now represented on the pension rolls.

At the close of the war, when the country was staggering under a great weight of debt and taxation, the men who controlled the legislation of the country did not decline to provide for the payment of the public debt because it was large. Such action would have been both cowardly and dishonest. On the contrary, they faced the great problem with courage and solved it with wisdom and honor. They amended the constitution of the United States, and in amendment XIV., section 4, it is declared that "the validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts for payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned."

Here is a solemn constitutional recognition of the right of these soldiers to pensions, and of the duty of Congress to enact suitable laws granting the same. This amendment recognizes and protects two great classes of financial obligations. The one is to those who held the securities of the government issued to raise money to carry on the war; the other is to those who took the personal risks of war and whose patriotism and valor saved the Union. The heroism of the men in arms made the great cause triumphant, and by their success converted the depreciated obligations held by public creditors into glittering gold; and now when this mighty obligation of the old soldiers has matured, because of their infirmities and their weight of years, shall it be denied them because the sum is large?

In 1865 the interest charge upon the public debt was nearly $151,500,000, and the pensions were $8,500,000; an aggregate of $160,000,000. The public creditor expected his interest, and it was paid by the people without abatement. The population was then 35,000,000, and this annual charge of interest and pensions was $4.57 per capita. The public debt is now almost paid. It is

no longer a burden. The bondholders have received $2,600,179,000 in interest and premiums since July 1, 1861. The pensioners have received $1,284,716,000. The present interest charge for 1891 is $36,408,000, and the pensions for this year will cost $116,000,000, or an annual aggregate of interest and pensions of $152,408,000. We now have a population of 63,000,000 ; so that this annual expense of interest and pensions is $2.44 per capita.

The gratitude of this nation to its defenders should be measured by the value of the service rendered and the financial ability of this people to respond to the demands of just pension legislation.

When the War of the Rebellion closed, the public debt amounted to about one-tenth of the wealth of the country. Now it amounts to about one-fiftieth. Then the public debt was $63.50 per capita. Now it is $9.75 per capita. A new nation of 30,000,000 has been added to the population. The States now span the continent, and are traversed from ocean to ocean by great lines of railroad. There were none when the war closed. This country is now the grandest on earth. It is great in its territory and in its natural productions ; great in a mighty, free, homogeneous, law-abiding people ; great in its system of free government and the loyalty of its people to their institutions ; great in its progress, its productions, and its accumulated wealth, and great in the friendship of other peoples, and in their confidence and respect.

The generation of people who have come upon the stage of action since the war closed should understand that the blessings of peace and prosperity now enjoyed by the people of the United States are due to the patriotism and valor of the soldiers of the Union. These men met and overcame the greatest rebellion the world ever saw. The stake for which they contended was the greatest ever submitted to the arbitration of arms. They maintained the political unity of a country which God had made for one people. They solved the mooted question of man's capacity for self-government. They broke all the fetters of slavery. These men will pass away as a tale that is told, but their work will endure forever.

GREEN B. RAUM.

HOW TO REST.

BY WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, M. D., SURGEON-GENERAL, U. S. ARMY (RETIRED).

WHILE it is true that wealthy and well-to-do Americans require more rest for their wearied minds and bodies than do any other people in the world, it is equally certain that they almost uniformly fail to meet the necessities of the system in this respect.

After eight months of the year passed in exciting occupations or extravagant dissipations, they begin to talk of relaxation and repose, and straightway make preparations for a change of base, deceiving themselves with the idea that they are contemplating rest, while in reality intending to seek fresh fields on which to display their capacity for making money, and new varieties of pleasurable excesses on which to spend it. Such people have no idea of what rest really is. They seem to think that the one essential is change of air, and that if they go to the seashore or the mountains for three or four months in every year, it makes no difference how they employ their time while there, and that when they return to their ordinary routine of town or city life, they are completely fortified against the ill consequences of any excesses, whether of business or pleasure, into which they choose to plunge.

Now, change of air may be a very good thing, or it may not. A great many persons, so far from being benefited by it, are soon made sensible of the fact that it does not agree with them. The healthiest people in the world, such as the Swiss, the Norwegians, or the Scotch Highlanders, never get any change of air except such as comes to them from the winds that blow over their native mountains; and the like is true of the people of a great many portions of our own country. Common-sense teaches us that change of air such as attends upon removing from a healthy to an unhealthy locality must be injurious.

Still we may assume that the great majority of the people who give up their city life in the summer for the seashore or the mountains are not injured by the change of air. City air is generally about as bad as any that exists on the face of the globe, and it is scarcely possible for any one to be otherwise than benefited by getting out beyond the range of its influence.

But it is rest which we have to consider, and I propose to show that as it is ordinarily sought for in this country by the majority of the people who make the greatest pretensions of seeking it, it is almost, if not completely, unattainable by the methods they employ.

There are various kinds of rest. A person whose occupation is chiefly carried on by the use of his brain rests that organ when he changes his work to physical labor. Thus, a student who spends eight hours a day in intense mental application derives immense benefit, not only to his brain, but to his whole system, by a brisk walk of two or three hours or a like period employed in chopping wood. In such a case as this there is no complete rest for the body; it is simply a change of labor from one kind to another kind. It amounts to nothing more than a proper exercise for the mental and physical systems, and if accompanied with seven or eight hours' sleep and five or six hours for eating and amusement, might be carried on indefinitely in any ordinary healthy locality. The body does not require absolute rest, and, as a matter of fact, it never gets it; for even in sleep there is a not inconsiderable functional activity of various organs going on.

Such a student as I have referred to would receive great advantage from going to the woods, or the mountains, or the seashore for the summer, not to lie down in a hammock or to loll on the sand, but to take his books with him, preferably devoted to subjects different from those that he has studied in the city, and to exercise his muscles by rowing a boat or hunting for natural-history specimens on land or sea, instead of working in a gymnasium or walking up and down Broadway and Fifth Avenue. Such a person not only alters the character of his mental and physical labor, but he does it with such advantages as are to be derived from change of air and scene, and they are by no means inconsiderable.

Now, this is not rest: on the contrary, it is work, and very hard work, too; but no one can doubt that that student would return

to his regular pursuits with a mind and body invigorated and capable of doing better things than when he left the city.

Suppose, on the other hand, after having worked hard with his brain and his muscles for nine or ten months, he concludes that he ought to have complete rest, and goes to some secluded spot where the air is unexceptionable, and passes his time in comparative mental and physical inaction. He reads trashy novels, talks with trashy men and women, swings lazily in a hammock, goes to bed at nine o'clock and gets up at nine in the morning, and returns to town with a surplus of adipose tissue and his mind and body enfeebled by disease. The mere act of getting into the traces again and resuming his work is irksome to him and is accomplished with difficulty. His mental faculties act imperfectly and the product of their labor lacks its usual finish. A slight amount of mental exertion makes his head ache; he turns to his wood-chopping or his gymnasium or his walks on Broadway or Fifth Avenue, and he finds that an amount of muscular exercise that he formerly endured with pleasure now makes him puff and blow and causes his muscles to ache. Many days elapse before he gets into the rut and all the organs of his body run smoothly again.

It is still worse with the ordinary man of business who has, at the same time, as he thinks, a position in society to maintain. What he seeks is some place within easy range of his financial or mercantile headquarters, and in which he and his family can continue the festivities of their city life. There is no essential alteration in their mode of existence except what they get from change of air and scene, and this does not necessarily imply rest. Letters and telegrams relating to business are received hourly. The Stock-Exchange quotations, the state of the markets, come as systematically to Newport or Saratoga as they do to Wall Street or Broadway. The mind pursues its endless course of speculation as to the increase or loss of wealth. The dinners, the balls, are as elegant and as frequent as they were when the family occupied their mansion in Fifth Avenue.

The requirements of fashion as regards dress are quite as rigorous as they were during the winter at the height of the city season, if not more so, and fully as much time is taken from that which ought to be devoted to sleep in order that both body and mind may be recuperated. Is it a wonder, therefore, that

the men and women who pursue this sort of life, in which there is a ceaseless round of business and dissipation, should be worn and haggard, be nervous and hysterical, the victims of nervous prostration, ceasing to live long before they have attained to the "three score and ten years" which the Bible allots as the ordinary span of human life?

The fact is that the average American is incapable of self-amusement. He requires to be entertained; he is essentially gregarious; the idea of going into the woods or to the seashore or the mountains by himself, or at most with a congenial companion, is in the highest degree repugnant to him. He loathes that privacy and seclusion from the eyes of his fellows which it would appear every well-ordered person ought to desire. He likes glare and excitement and turmoil and noise. When he goes into a sedately-lighted room, in which he only wishes to sit down and rock to and fro with a cigar in his mouth, the first thing he does is to turn on all the light. A quiet town, one suited for repose of mind, he speaks of as a "graveyard." He wants to be in the "swim," as he calls it, all the time. A day without his newspaper in which he can read of the state of the markets, and of all the crimes and scandals which have occurred throughout the world in the past twenty-four hours, is to him a day lost.

It is true that matters are different with those who are not in business for themselves, but who are working for others. When they take a holiday, they leave their business behind them and spend the two or three weeks allowed them in actual recreation. They are not going to bother themselves with the state of the markets. It does not concern them especially whether New York Central falls or rises a point or two, and when they come back to their stuffy little offices, in which the light of day has to be eked out with gas or electricity, they can talk of the tramps they have had in the Adirondacks or of the bluefish they have caught in the Great South Bay. However, with very many young Americans the time comes when they feel that they must shake off the trammels which bind them to another man's service, and then it is that the natural process of decay, which exists in all of us, acquires the greatest degree of rapidity in them, for they rush at once into the mode of life which their business superiors have followed and upon which they have long been eagerly waiting to enter.

With women in what may be called the higher walks of life it is even worse than it is with men, for there is almost nothing to which they can turn for amusement or employment outside of the frivolities of society. Their education is so conducted that when they leave school they have a smattering of a good many things, but a solid, substantial knowledge of almost nothing. How many so-called society women did any one ever see who could take a paper-pad and a pencil and go out into the fields and sketch from nature? And yet there is scarcely a well-bred English woman who cannot do this, and do it well. How many have anything more than the most superficial knowledge of music, and do we not know that even this is forgotten as soon as they leave school? How many of them know anything of English literature, or of any other literature except that evanescent French variety which, from their imperfect knowledge of the language, they can barely comprehend, and which it would be better for them not to know at all? For such people there is really nothing else than to go from the dinners, balls, and parties of the city to the dinners, balls, and parties of Newport or other fashionable summer resorts. Excitement of some kind they must have. Without it life is a burden to them.

In short, a man or a woman is to be managed in respect to rest in very much the same way that a farmer manages his field. The latter knows the advantage of a succession of crops. He knows that if he plants cabbages every successive year in the same piece of ground, he will, in a short time, have very poor cabbages and very poor ground; whereas, by changing from one thing to another, the product is better and the earth is not deteriorated. He knows also how much his land is improved by allowing it to lie fallow every now and then. Men and women, like the fields of the earth, require change, and, like them, they require rest; and these objects can never be attained in the way that the average American sets out to get them.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND.

THE NEW POLITICAL PARTY.

BY THE HON. SYLVESTER PENNOYER, GOVERNOR OF OREGON.

THE wonderful shaking of dry bones, and the more wonderful appearance of that "exceeding great army" which the prophet of the Almighty beheld about twenty-five centuries ago, after the soft breath of the four winds had passed over the open valley which lay at his feet, have almost been rivalled by the sudden appearance of a new party within the national political arena; with this difference, however—that the shaking of dry bones did not precede, but will follow, its advent. It is an instructive study, not, however, embraced in the purpose of this article, to trace the origin and growth of political parties in this country. It will be ascertained that whatever party appeals most to the sense of justice, and stands most prominently as the defender of the rights of the weak and oppressed, will sooner or later triumph in spite of what seemed at its formation insurmountable obstacles. And this fact goes to the credit side of our national character. Is there a necessity for a new political party in our government at this time? The answer is plain, and it will spring simultaneously from the lips of every honest man. There is a necessity for a new party if there be flagrant governmental abuses which are unnoticed and popular demands for justice which are unheeded by the existing political organizations. Are there such? Let the records answer.

The existing political organizations have been engaged for several years in a chivalric contest over the per cent. of tariff taxes which should be laid upon certain articles of import, and attention has been closely riveted to such warfare, having thereby been adroitly led away from the consideration of much graver abuses.

In the last presidential canvass, for instance, the discussion was cunningly confined to the tariff, while other abuses, tenfold more baneful in their results upon the national prosperity, were entirely unnoticed. Neither party opposed the inequitable tariff system itself, the most unjust and unequal mode of taxation ever devised by the ingenuity of man, and neither party opposed that most pernicious adjustment of the system by which the great masses of

the people are taxed, by the levy of protective duties, for the benefit of one or more particular industries. Both parties were pledged to the tariff system and to its protective feature ; the one by its record and its platform, and the other by the bill then pending in Congress. The sole issue which engaged the attention of a great nation of more than sixty millions of people was whether, in the distribution of favors by a protective tariff, the producer should share the spoils with the manufacturer ; one party claiming that the robbery of the consuming public by the tariff should be shared by the producer as well as the manufacturer, while the other party claimed that public interest demanded that such robbery in behalf of the producer should cease, and that it should be sanctioned alone for the benefit of the manufacturer.

And thus the ability of our statesmen and the attention of our people were centred exclusively upon the particular amount of the mint, anise, and cummin extorted by tariff taxation from the overburdened taxpayer that should go to the government and upon the particular amount that should go to the favored industries, while the weightier matters—the oppression of the people by the pernicious tariff system itself, as well as by a number of other equally indefensible instrumentalities—were entirely ignored. The great cormorants of aggrandized capital and of corporate power, which are now preying upon the very vitals of all of the industries of our national commonwealth, are, indeed, well pleased when public attention can thus be diverted from their wholesale plunder of our people to the far smaller plunder involved by any particular arrangement of tariff duties. Those statesmen, so-called, the scope of whose vision is inadequate to the discovery of any governmental abuses except those inflicted by some objectionable adjustment of our tariff laws, are, although perhaps unwittingly, the most serviceable stool-pigeons of corporate and capitalistic power, inasmuch as they draw attention exclusively to the wrongs of the tariff robbery, thus leaving these greater public robbers free scope to continue their unstinted pillage both of the public treasury and of private pockets.

The existing parties themselves are responsible for the formation of this new political organization. For the last quarter of a century the natural evolutions of national life, as well as the legitimate results of pernicious legislation, have propelled new questions of paramount interest into prominence ; and yet neither

party has had the courage to voice the public conscience upon such questions, while both parties, with ears deaf to the popular demand, have been laboriously engaged in their old and tiresome game of battledore and shuttlecock upon the tariff.

There has been a popular demand for an income tax, heretofore almost unwritten and unspoken, and yet as widespread as the national limits and as universally entertained among the masses of the people as is the demand for right, for the reason that there is not one single citizen of this republic whose sense of justice does not impel him to declare that the wealth of the country, now entirely exempted from taxation by the federal government, should bear its just proportion of the public burden. And there has been equally as strong a protest of the great masses of the people against the flagrant injustice of our financial policy by which a favored class, enriched at the people's expense by the operation of statute laws, has been allowed, unrestricted by law, to use its ill-gotten wealth to still further batten upon the public. Both the demand and the protest have been entirely unheeded by the present political parties, and hence the new organization.

There have been, and there are now, several other governmental abuses and derelictions for which the two old parties are responsible. Among them are the granting to private corporations the loan of millions of money and vast empires of land for the building of railroads, which, when built, are permitted to exact excessive charges from the people; the usurpation of a governmental function by a private corporation in the transmission of intelligence without restrictions of law upon its charges against the government itself, as well as against the people; the usurped interference by the federal judiciary, within the States, with their laws and tribunals; the degradation of one of the precious metals and the denial of its free coinage by Congress, thus imposing an unexpected hardship upon the States, to which, under the constitution, is denied the privilege of coining money, while they are restricted, at the same time, to the use of gold and silver as legal-tender; but far above any of these in importance are the entire exemption of the wealth of the country, as such, from federal taxation, which can be remedied by the imposition of a graduated income tax, and the faulty and almost criminal financial policy of the government, through which the wealth of our people has been transferred from the pockets of the many to the vaults of the

few, and the federal treasury controlled and used in the interest of bondholders and stock-jobbers. The present financial system of the government is the worst of existing national abuses, and to remedy this is justly the rallying cry of the new political party.

It is, indeed, most probable, if the Democratic party had kept true to its ancient faith, that the new party would never have come into existence, inasmuch as the former would have, to a great extent, voiced the popular demands. In its earlier and better days it was in all verity a "people's party." It was inflexibly opposed to the aggrandizement of both governmental and capitalistic power. The national Democratic platform of 1856 declared the sentiments of the party upon its financial policy—and it was the reiteration of former platforms—as follows :

> "That Congress has no power to charter a national bank ; that we believe such an institution one of deadly hostility to the best interests of the country, dangerous to our republican institutions and the liberties of the people, and calculated to place the business of the country within the control of a concentrated money power and above the laws and will of the people ;" "that the separation of the money of the government from banking institutions is indispensable for the safety of the funds and the rights of the people."

Thus it will be seen that if that party had adhered to the faith of its founders it would have answered the widespread demand for the abrogation of the present financial policy of the government, and if, in obedience to its instincts, it had moved forward, defiant, as of yore, of the money power, in support of the fiscal system, now demanded by justice, reason, and the popular will, of basing the required paper currency of the country upon its tangible and imperishable real property, for the benefit of the many, instead of on the national indebtedness, for the enrichment of the few, it would to-day be what it was for more than a half-century of its existence—the faithful tribune of the whole people.

It is upon the trend of its financial policy mainly that the new party responds to the necessity of the times and complies with the demands of the people, and it is therefore of the most urgent importance that such a policy should be entirely unassailable both as to its justice and its practical operation. The demand for an entire change in the fiscal system of the government is widespread. It has been occasioned by the flagrant injustice of the present system, and by the impoverishment of the many for the enrichment of the few which is the legitimate result of its operations.

The mutterings of discontent, although heretofore disregarded, have been universal. They could find no expression in the platform of any existing political party, and therefore have been contemned as well as unheeded. These mutterings have at length found voice in a new political organization, and their long-pent-up expression will undoubtedly be the great slogan of the coming presidential contest. Hence it is of the most vital concern to the party itself, as well as to the people whose interests it would subserve, that its financial policy should be one that can be defended upon the grounds of justice, of public necessity, and of business principles. If such a policy can be formulated, the young stripling of a party will win to its following the honest-hearted yeomanry of the whole country, and may achieve a political victory unrivalled in this country for more than half a century past.

In the first place, therefore, the currency which is proposed to be issued should be based upon a perfectly secure and imperishable foundation, and should be a legal-tender for all debts, public and private. Such a basis can only be furnished by the real property of the country. To accept personal security, or any other security than the improved real property of the country, would be to hazard the loan ; which the government, in the interest of the whole people, poor as well as rich, cannot justly do. There can be no better or safer security for a government loan than the real property of the nation. If the loan is placed upon such property at one-half or one-third of its real value, it is as secure as the government itself, and the currency based upon such a loan is as good as a government bond or gold and silver.

The main argument against such a policy is based upon its supposed impracticability. This has been answered by stubborn facts. The State of Oregon has now more than two million dollars of school money loaned out upon the improved farm property of the State. The amount of the loan is fixed at one-third of the fairly-appraised value of the farm. The entire management of the loan is confided to the State School Land Board, consisting of the Governor, Secretary of State, and State Treasurer, and is without any cost to the State other than that involved in the salaries paid to the members of the board for their entire official duties, amounting in all to $3,800 per annum. The applicant pays for the examination of the title to his land and its appraisement by the attorney of the board for the county in which the land is situated. The machinery is per-

fect and comparatively inexpensive, and the security the best in the world. The loans for the whole State are made by the State Board at the capital, and the distribution of funds throughout the State is fairly made. This system has been a blessing to Oregon farmers, and it may be a blessing to the farmers of the whole country by demonstrating the entire feasibility of loaning government money upon the improved real property of the country.

The next question of importance evolved by the proposed financial system is: How shall the money be procured by the government for making such a loan? If required, it could and would be procured as it was in order to carry on the late war, but the amount to be provided would to a great extent depend upon the exact conditions of the fiscal policy to be established.

If the loans were made to the people upon improved real property at the rate not exceeding 4 per cent., and the currency for such loans, as well as gold and silver, was changeable at will into government treasury notes or bonds bearing interest not exceeding 3 per cent., the result would undoubtedly be that the issuance of not nearly so much currency would be required as would be if no such provision for funding it was made, inasmuch as investors in government securities would largely furnish the required amount. If a policy be adopted of changing the currency into bonds, and the bonds into currency, at the will of the holder of either, under the necessary restrictions, the whole financial business of the country could be adjusted to the proposed system without any greater enlargement of the volume of the currency of the country than its actual business requirements demand. Such a policy would place the currency of the nation upon the safest foundation possible, and would entirely preclude those extremes of contraction and expansion so hurtful to business interests; for if there should be in circulation more money than could be advantageously used, it would seek investment in government securities, while, if there should be an urgent need for more, the bonds would be changed into currency.

The loaning of money by the government at 4 per cent. would at once fix that rate throughout the country without any other or further legislation, and the capital now employed at ruinous rates of interest as leeches upon the people, thereby exhausting the life-blood from all of our industrial pursuits, would, by the conditions confronting it, be invested to a large extent in govern-

ment securities, thereby furnishing a portion of the currency required, or, if not so invested, it would be compelled to seek out new enterprises for its employment. Thus the accumulated wealth of our plethoric capitalists, now overburdening our national industries with its ruinous exactions, checked in its unlicensed power, would patiently and effectively subserve the common weal.

The inauguration of such a fiscal policy would open a new and brighter era in the history of our country. The vast and rapid accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few and the impoverishment of the many by the excessive rates charged for the use of money would at once cease, and, money, being cheap, would open up new avenues of industry and give renewed impetus to trade and increased employment to labor, and, being stable in value and sufficient in volume, would impart security to every enterprise and fair remuneration to every laudable calling. And thus would the general government at last fulfil its constitutional duty to the people by regulating the value of money, which it has never yet done, and never can fully do until by some such means as is proposed it regulates the interest which it shall bear. The fixing of rates of interest on money regulates, in the main, its value. The only class that would not be pecuniarily benefited by the adoption of such a fiscal system would be that class that has been enriched by the existing financial policy of the government, and that is with its ill-gotten wealth sucking the life-blood from the industrial classes of the country by the excessive rates of interest now prevailing, and by the contraction and expansion of currency it is instrumental in producing for its own benefit.

But even that class would in the end be benefited. It would not proceed long in its present way. Such a colossal aggregation of wealth by the few for the next quarter of a century as has marked the last quarter would precipitate a revolution. The impoverished and starving masses, impelled by the privation and hunger of their wives and children, would, like tortured beasts, at last turn and rend the supposed cause of their miseries. The plain alternative presented to that class and to the whole people of this country, so far as our financial system is concerned, is reform or revolution. And whatsoever party shall bring about the needed reformation in the fiscal policy of the government will secure the favor of a just God and the support of a grateful people.

SYLVESTER PENNOYER.

TRADES-UNIONS FOR WOMEN.

BY LADY DILKE.

THE history of trades-unionism among women in England is the history of the Women's Trades-Union League, and that history ought to have a special claim on the attention of American readers, since the organization of the league in 1874 was undertaken in avowed imitation of the "friendly societies" for women which had already, it was said, done much for the working classes in the United States. I first heard of these societies from a woman named Emma Smith (afterwards Mrs. Paterson), a printer by trade. In her capacity of secretary to an organization for the promotion of women's suffrage, Emma told me she had listened to many flaming speeches from women's-rights' partisans, and had sat under many fair American orators; but of all this talk one thing only had made a deep impression on her, and that was an account of certain "friendly" societies given in her hearing by one of these ladies. So Emma spent her savings on a journey to America, and on her return to England founded the league now known throughout the land as the Women's Trades-Union League.

In those days none dared speak bravely of trades-unionism; it was something which meant, to the common ear, deeds of violence, of darkness, and the use of illegal or even criminal methods, synonymous with the destruction of property and life, whilst to the more educated it was an irremissible sin against the inspired ordinances of "political economy." When, therefore, Emma Smith came back from the States and called on her friends to support her scheme for helping working women to help themselves, they one and all insisted that the society should be christened in such wise as would not suggest, to the casual hearer, its true character. So it came about that we hit on the title Pro-

tective and Provident League. It was not till about four years ago that our friends gathered courage sufficient to substitute the word "Trades-Union" for the adjective "Protective." Since then, indeed, things have gone so fast that "Provident" has followed suit, and our old friend the Protective and Provident League now stands honestly confessed as a league for the promotion of trades-unions amongst women.

In connection with this change I well remember an amusing incident which occurred during our early years, and which illustrates the necessity for what may now seem absurd precautions, as well as the uselessness of such prudential blinds except in the case of the general public. It was intended to start what was euphuistically termed a "society" amongst the women employed in a factory in a provincial English town, and a meeting was called in which many of the leading inhabitants, noted for their general philanthropy, were expected to take part. One of our friends announced with great triumph, just before the proceedings commenced, that she had captured a university professor, —a professor, indeed, of logic,—and she added that he had not only said he would attend, but had also promised a donation toward the expenses of starting the good work. When, however, Emma Paterson had finished her little explanatory speech, the professor cried out aghast: "Why, this is trades-unionism! I can have nothing to do with you; you are trying to violate the laws of political economy!" So the professor withdrew his subscription and himself. He was quite ready to give money in charity,—that is, as a voluntary rate in aid of insufficient wages,—but he regarded as criminal any attempt to enable these suffering women to obtain by combination better remuneration for labor carried on under conditions which constituted a danger to society.

Since those days the little league has made steady progress, working without encouragement against almost overwhelming odds, but within the last two years it has profited greatly by the public attention which has been drawn to labor questions generally. The sympathy which was accorded to the "dockers" has since been widely extended to various other forms of underpaid labor, and of these women may certainly claim to have more than their full share. What is called the "new unionism," which first attracted notice during the struggle at the docks, appears, on examination, to be but the old unionism proceeding by more

hazardous and sensational methods; yet it has done good service to the cause, and especially to the cause which the Women's Trades-Union League has in hand, in two ways. In the first place, by appealing to the element of sentiment which always plays so large a part in the decisions of the British public, the "new" unionism has struck a great blow at the root of the prejudice which has long lingered against combination for any but "friendly" purposes; and, in the second, it has shown that it is possible to organize with effect—if only for a time—the least skilled and the most underpaid forms of labor; that is to say, it has touched the very classes amongst which the league is most desirous of promoting combination.

The success which crowned the famous strike inspired our friends with fresh confidence, whilst the notoriety given in the daily press to facts concerning the conditions of the lowest forms of modern industry—to which for years past the league has been vainly calling public attention—has procured for us an amount of sympathy and support which we had well-nigh despaired of obtaining. Even those who would still continue to deny to men the right of organization, change their tone when speaking of women, and are content to make an arbitrary distinction wherever they are concerned. Women, they will now tell us, must be regarded as standing on a wholly different footing to men: translated into plain English this means, I take it, that they are, in fact, so helpless and oppressed that no amount of organization can ever enable them to hold their own, much less take the offensive successfully as men have done. The league has, therefore, recently received considerable support even from the most orthodox section of the British middle class, and this support it has done its best to deserve by the mingled prudence and resolution with which it has steered its course in the past; for, whilst always ready to act with determination, whenever there is clear occasion for it, in the protection of the interests of working women, it has as steadily striven, wherever possible, to avoid those extreme courses which may be a good advertisement, but which too often have the most disastrous results for the interests of those concerned.

At a critical moment, about two years ago, the secretary of the league, Miss Black, who had succeeded to Mrs. Paterson's labors, and who had done good service to the cause by her

speeches and writings, transferred her services to a newer organization, which, being under the patronage of Mr. Champion and Mr. Burns, seemed likely to secure a larger measure of popular support. It was then feared that the elder society might suffer in consequence, and its friends felt some apprehension as to its future; but the vacant place was instantly filled by Miss Florence Routledge, half-sister of Mr. Edmund Routledge, the well-known publisher, and she has discharged the duties of the post with such marked ability and energy that the league, then languishing, has taken a fresh lease of life and is slowly spreading its influence throughout the United Kingdom. Within the last year, under Miss Routledge's superintendence, the work of disseminating the principles of trades-unionism has been systematized, and also vastly extended by a scheme of affiliation which grew out of the experience gathered in some country tours, undertaken by members of the committee, in different districts which it was desired to organize. Everywhere—even in places where the appeal to women to unite had seemed most successful—it was found that the enthusiasm aroused by the presence of the visitors from London failed or died away amongst the difficulties which had to be encountered in founding or carrying on the union after their departure. Sometimes the men unionists in the district were ready and able to help the women, but the women were afraid to trust themselves in their hands; sometimes the women relapsed from fear (often groundless) of their employers; and sometimes they dropped away solely because there seemed no immediate benefit to be derived from the self-denying thrift which would alone enable them to keep up their union contributions. "The men in Hawick," writes a friend to Miss Routledge, "are in despair as to the organization of the women; the numbers in their union have sunk again to a hundred. Of the thirty-six who sent in their names when you were here in March, only fourteen have turned out paying members."

Disappointments of this kind it has, however, seemed possible to prevent, either by authorizing delegates to spend several weeks in each district, or by undertaking that the speakers sent to organize, in the first instance, should revisit their converts within a stated time. It was clearly impossible that the league, with its limited staff, should permit its delegates to devote many weeks to

any one place, but the committee thought it feasible to arrange for periodical visits by systematizing and regulating the expeditions which the members were already in the habit of carrying out. It was therefore decided that any union composed of women, or admitting women as members, having previously satisfied the league of its sound financial condition, should be admitted as an affiliated union, being entitled, on condition of paying a small annual contribution to the funds of the league, to certain rights and privileges, amongst which was that of receiving a visit, once a year, from the secretary or other member of the committee. With this object it was further decided that two annual tours should be mapped out and carried through in spring and autumn, by means of which it was hoped that new unions would be formed and old ones strengthened and stimulated to increasing exertions.

In this connection it will be seen that public agitation is necessarily a prominent part of the programme of the league. A few months after the present honorable secretary took up the duties of her post, the committee, feeling that this part of their duties had hitherto been somewhat neglected, requested her to place herself in communication with every trades council existing in districts where women were largely employed. The result of this step at once showed that, even where the women were apathetic, the men in the trades were fully aware of the danger that disorganized labor, whether male or female, was to their own standing in the market. From every large centre of women's industry came the cry: "Our women are not properly organized; we can do nothing with them. Come and see if you can help us!" From the far north of Scotland, from the linen mills of Ireland, we have heard repeated the same story that is echoing from the forges of Staffordshire or the looms of Lancashire and Yorkshire. "The women," say the men, "are doing men's work at half-pay; they are driving us from the trades: we would stop their working if we could; but as we can't, help us to organize them at once, lest worse befall us." Not philanthropy, but self-interest, is awake, and is forcing rapidly forward the extension and application to women's labor of those principles on which men, to a large extent, have managed to protect their own. It is well known, for example, that in every district in which the weaving trades are carried on the labor of women has been supplanting the labor of men, not because they work better, but

because they work more cheaply. In other trades, as, for example, amongst the chain- and nail-makers, we find wives and daughters in active competition with their husbands and fathers, engaged, as Mr. Burnett forcibly put it in his report of 1888, "in dragging down their wages to still lower levels." It is plain that this condition of things can be turned to account and is too often turned to account by unscrupulous employers, so that it constitutes a menace to the industry of men. And when we pass from the factory to the "domestic workshop," whether it be in the sweaters' den in Whitechapel or at the hearth-forges of Halesowen and Cradley Heath, we find all such evils intensified, for domestic labor isolates the workers and renders well-nigh impossible that common understanding and unity of effort which are now necessary to the regulation of the trades.

The most promising field for trades-unionism is, therefore, to be found in districts such as Lancashire, where the women are working in great factories; and the least hopeful to deal with are places like Birmingham, where their labor for the most part is subdivided and they are broken up into twos and threes. Numbers as small as these will often be found working for sweaters in the sham-jewelry trade. Thus it comes to pass, as we should naturally expect, that the highest numbers of women unionists are to be counted in such organizations as that of the Northern Counties' Weavers' Association, a society numbering nearly 47,000 members, of whom 26,000 are women. Mr. Birtwhistle, to whose kindness I am indebted for these figures, adds: "There are other associations of weavers, not directly connected with this amalgamation, which will swell the numbers up to 65,000, in which women will bear the same proportion." The membership of the Card- and Blowing-Rooms Amalgamated Association, at Manchester, shows also a good two-thirds women and girls out of a total of about 14,000, and this proportion is preserved, with few exceptions, in other centres of the textile industries, where the unions are energetically and ably managed by the men, who are fellow-laborers with the women. As soon as we come to the iron and hardware trades, the results are not so good. In the chain trade, for instance, the women are fairly well organized, thanks to the efforts of Mr. Juggins and Mr. Smith; but in the spike-nail trade, although the union has secured for them an advance of 35 per cent., the greatest difficulty is experienced in keeping them in the society, whilst of those employed in

the screwing department connected with the nut and bolt trade it may be said that they have never been organized at all. The Midland Counties' Trade Federation, which has made great efforts to organize the districts in which these industries are carried on, has been, in fact, so seriously hampered by the large proportion of home labor affecting the general conditions of these trades that it has not reaped anything like the harvest which it had a right to expect from the very considerable sacrifices of time and money which it has made in the cause of the organization of female labor. Nothing daunted, however, by past failure, the federation is still steadily working, and it is hoped that the delegates of the league may be able to arouse the women and induce them to profit by the help now so freely offered.

The poorest result, at least in point of numbers, is shown when we come to look over the lists of unions formed and managed entirely by women themselves. In London there are some fifteen or sixteen formed by the league alone, and I would put their total membership at something under 2,000, for hardly any single union counts more than 200 members. The Laundresses' Union reckons, indeed, from 400 to 500, but this figure is made up from several different branches; the excellent Bookbinders' Union has but 200, and some, such as that of the shirt- and collar-makers, drop much lower. From all the inquiries which I have made I am inclined to think that the situation is much the same throughout the country, and is everywhere due to pretty much the same causes. In the first place, where the staple labor in any trade is that of women, and enters, as in the textile trades, into direct competition with the labor of men, it is worth the while of the men to take up their organization; but where the women are not an appreciable factor, or where the trade, as shirt- and collar-making, is entirely in their own hands, they are left to their sole resources. Now, women, as a rule, are "slack" officials and do not understand "working up" a society: not only so, but the trades which are left wholly to them are the little trades, underpaid trades, and trades carried on, to a great extent, in small workshops and by home labor.

Under these circumstances, it is sometimes asked whether, given the great difficulty of finding trained organizers and agitators amongst working women, it would not be, on the whole, wiser for the league to confine itself to inducing women to enter

unions established and managed by men. This is, indeed, the course to which the committee inclines : it is only when there is no existing union managed by men, or the existing union closes its doors to women, or the women are working in a trade in which they alone are employed, that the league urges the formation of an independent society. It is obviously better for women and better for the state that their industrial position, whenever possible, should be dealt with as but a part of the general problem, and that their organization should be as little as possible dissociated from the organization of the men. Unfortunately, the men do not often take sufficient pains to develop the business powers of the women who enter their unions, nor do they give them adequate representation in their management : the education of the women does not advance ; and in one case, where great difficulties had arisen, and application for advice had been made to the league, it was found necessary, in order to give the women a chance for life, to recommend that they should be detached from the men's union and forced to manage their own business for themselves.

This was, however, an extreme case. As a rule the situation may be described in the words of Mr. Birtwhistle writing to me of the constitution of the Northern Counties' Weavers' Association. "Females," he says, "take no part in the management, although we do not prohibit them from doing so ; on the contrary, we have on several occasions endeavored to induce them to do so, but have failed." Yet it must be remembered that men in dealing with their women members are at present at a great disadvantage : one of the most capable and experienced of men unionists in the kingdom, after addressing a large meeting of women, turned round to me and said: "It is very strange, somehow ; say what we will we cannot get at these women." He forgot that the women had been for so long treated as a class apart, and as an inferior class, that they naturally distrusted the good intentions of men, whom they had been led to regard only as rivals.

For the present, therefore, both because there are many women's trades to organize, and because the training in separate unions is a useful education for them, it is necessary to carry on the work on a double system ; but the growing tendency to unite —wherever trade conditions permit—various groups of workers in a single society seems likely, in the future, to afford a way out of our present difficulties. The strong caste feeling, which even

more than the pressure of trade exigencies has determined the separate organization of men's unions hitherto, has prevailed with more than equal force amongst women. In the past it has been found impossible—except in individual instances—to induce women working in what may be called established trades of a well-paid and socially-respectable character, to join hands with those less fortunate and less skilled; consequently it was of no use to look to them for the help by which the half-starved rank and file who belong to the odd trades might be moved and brought up to the level at which union becomes practical. The example which has been set in this direction, however, by the new unionism and the birth, under its auspices, of societies such as the Gas-Workers and General Laborers' Union, is already producing good effect, and the unions more recently organized by the league, as, for instance, the London Laundresses and General Working-Women's Amalgamated Association, have been founded on an equally wide basis.

The present pressure in this direction also necessarily affects the very constitution and character of these associations: whereas it was once a cardinal point of doctrine that all unions should have their benefit or friendly side, as well as their trade objects, and the contributions of the members were therefore based on a scale sufficient to meet calls of both descriptions, the effort to combine the worst-paid workers has brought about the abandonment in many cases of that "friendly" character to which the league has always attached great importance. It is, indeed, evidently useless, where you find women whose total weekly earnings never exceed five shillings, to ask them to pay contributions adequate to a double purpose until their wages have been brought above the starvation level. Hence it seems not unlikely that societies of the type of the Newcastle National Labor Federation, which attempts the combination of all classes of workers (men and women) for purely trade objects, and which is conducted on the lowest possible rate of contribution, have a prospect of great immediate usefulness before them. In fact, I am inclined to think that as these amalgamations increase in size their business will be more and more subdivided—that is, the unions which undertake the insurance and risks of trade disputes will leave sick-insurance, superannuation funds, insurance against casualties, and so forth, to other societies established with a view to one or more of these objects.

Under the influence of these considerations, the league, whilst continuing to set a high value on the provident side of its work, has freely accepted the task of coöperation with societies of the new class, and in this it has the advantage of its peculiar position in that it represents no section of opinion, but, being solely concerned with the organization of working women, is free to work with any who are ready to forward their interests in this respect. Nothing, indeed, is more surprising to those who knew the position of this little society in its infancy than to look over the applications for help which now come in to the executive committee. This executive committee, on which every secretary properly accredited from a London women's union is allowed to sit and vote, transacts all its business in a shabby little den off Broad Street, Bloomsbury, which is dignified by the name "Industrial Hall." This "Hall" is the library, which is at the service of all women unionists on payment of a nominal fee; it is the secretary's only office, where she and her assistant, Miss Holyoake, sit daily. Meetings are held and even entertainments are given within its narrow four walls. Not, indeed, that the members would not thankfully accept premises better fitted for their work,—they are engaged at the present moment in raising funds for the building of a Women's Trades Hall,—but just now the members feel that whilst the scanty salary of the assistant secretary and all the expenses of the organizing work have to be found out of the precarious three hundred a year, which is the utmost received from the public even in a good year, it would not be right to indulge in the ordinary—some would say the indispensable—conveniences of a place of business.

It must be confessed that it would be impossible to do anything with such an income and such machinery, were it not for the self-sacrificing devotion of the chief officers. The honorary secretary, Miss Routledge, gives her services, and so does the treasurer, Miss Abraham, who gets through, in the course of the year, fully as much organizing work as does Miss Routledge herself. Furthermore, in addition to its luck in securing the unpaid services of its chief officers, the league has been fortunate in inspiring outsiders with something of the same zeal, and thus it contrives to get the cause taken up in districts apparently beyond its influence. Whenever, in town or country, any one is found willing to work, willing to accept responsibility, and fit to be

trusted, the league wisely delegates authority, treats the new worker as a corresponding member, and refrains from interference. Thus, in the country, it reckons amongst its stanch supporters and good friends Mrs. Byles, of Bradford, and Miss Isabella Ford, of Leeds; and in London, in like manner, the work of organizing the match-box-makers of Shoreditch has been taken up by the generous action of Mrs. Reilly, a lady who, being occupied all day in a city office, gives her hard-won hours of leisure to the uphill work of nursing a union drawn from a class engaged in "home" labor. In another district we find a niece of His Eminence Cardinal Manning ready to devote herself to the equally difficult task of combining seamstresses, whilst a lady fresh from college honors is doing duty as general secretary for the laundresses.

This sort of service is, it must be remembered, of the dullest possible description; it is also the most valuable and the least easy to get. Ladies are often ready to help, but they can rarely help in the right way. They cannot understand how inexorable the work is in its demands on time, and that, if a Tuesday be the night fixed for meeting by a young society, then on Tuesdays all other claims, however pleasant or pressing, must be set aside. Once fail to attend and meet your women on their "office" night, and they will be dissatisfied; fail them twice, and symptoms of disorganization will show themselves, and will threaten results only to be averted by double the efforts and sacrifices needed in the first instance to keep the union on its feet. Hundreds of workers are wanted like the veteran Mrs. Ellis; or Miss Whyte, of the London bookbinders, who was the first to join Mrs. Paterson in her crusade; or Mrs. Hutchinson, the active secretary of the laundresses; or Miss Kate Taylor, of Glasgow, the first woman sent as a delegate from a trades council to the trades congress; for, although interest is awakened and is growing in the class which the league desires to reach, confidence is slow to come, and it will take years of labor spent in rousing and drilling the "awkward squads" before we are likely to see an increase of unionism amongst women at all proportionate to its growth amongst men. Nevertheless, this need not discourage us. Men have been years in organizing, and there are peculiar difficulties in the way of women. The responsible officials of a trades-union must not only be acquainted with the conditions of labor, but must also have initiative and force

sufficient to deal with those conditions successfully. However willing the men may be to call women to their side, we must recognize the fact that the labor of the latter has been, as a rule, of too dependent a character to give them a chance of training for administrative posts, and for a long time to come they must rely on outside help.

Those of us who, like myself, have been brought through this work into that close contact with the lowest conditions of labor on a scale which is in itself an experience rarely granted to women of our class, have become more and more convinced that organization is the only way to meet the terrible problems which we have to face; but, although we have to set ourselves against home labor and to call on the women at the forge, at the spindle, and the loom to stand shoulder to shoulder with the men and fight the battle of modern industry with them in the market of the world, yet we do this feeling, many of us, day by day the more strongly, that our place, the place of the women in the land, is not here, but at the hearth. If there were no other reason, a sufficient ground for our labors might be found in this,—that the homes of England are at stake; we are fighting for the manhood of her men, for the health of her women, for the future of her little children.

It is the home and the true welfare of the family which are menaced by the unregulated competition which, in our agricultural districts, sends the wife into the winter fields whilst the husband too often lounges by the pothouse fire; which hunts the Lancashire woman from her doors in the dawning day whilst the babe is yet hanging to her breast, or which chains the growing girl to the forge and rewards her week of labor by half a crown. We ask ourselves, Is it good that the man should stand idle? Is it good that the wife should work whilst the little ones cry for their mother, and her girls and boys are at play in the streets? And why does the married woman snatch greedily at the most miserably-paid forms of labor? Not because she has not enough to do at home, but because the husband's wage has been reduced till it no longer suffices for the maintenance of his family; because the little boy has no boots to go to school in, or the little girl lacks the warm clothing necessary to protect her in the bitter winter weather.

How can we blame the mother who, in such a case, sells her labor cheap? Yet that is what we must do, for we have to tell

her that by accepting less than a fair day's wage for a fair day's work she is betraying her own interests, the interests of her husband, and the interests and future of her children. Even so it would be shameless to blame her, had we no remedy to propose; but in organization and union we have, as we believe, an all-potent remedy to offer. "Women," we say, "unite, combine, help your men to protect themselves and you. You will make things a little better soon for yourselves, and by-and-by a great deal better for the children who shall rise up to call you blessed."

EMILIA F. S. DILKE.

THE WAR—SOME UNPUBLISHED HISTORY.

BY THE HON. CHARLES A. DANA.

Some time in February or March, 1864, a slender and prepossessing young fellow, between twenty-two and twenty-six apparently, applied at the War Department in Washington for employment as a spy within the Confederate lines. The main body of the Army of Northern Virginia was then lying at Gordonsville, and the headquarters of the Army of the Potomac were at Culpeper Court-House. General Grant had not yet come from the West to take command of the momentous campaign which finally opened with his movement into the Wilderness in the beginning of May.

The young man who sought this terrible service was well dressed and intelligent, and professed to be animated by motives purely patriotic. He was a clerk in the Treasury Department or the Interior Department, or possibly in one of the bureaus of the War Department; I don't remember which. All that he asked was that he should have a horse and an order which would carry him safely through the Federal lines; and in return he undertook to bring information from General Lee's army and from the government of the Confederacy in Richmond. He understood perfectly well the perilous nature of the enterprise he proposed.

Finding that the applicant bore a good character in the office where he was employed, it was determined to acccept his proposal. He was furnished with a horse, an order that would pass him through the Union lines, and, also, I believe, with a moderate sum of money; and then he departed. Two or three weeks later he reported at the War Department. He had been in Gordonsville and Richmond; had obtained the confidence of the Confederate authorities, and was the bearer of a letter from Mr. Jefferson Davis to Mr. Clement C. Clay, the agent of the Confederate

Government in Canada, then known to be stationed at St. Catherine's, not far from Niagara Falls. Mr. Clay had as his official associate Jacob Thompson, of Mississippi, who had been Secretary of the Interior in the cabinet of President Buchanan, and, like Mr. Clay, had been serving the Confederate Government ever since its organization. The letter from Mr. Davis the young man exhibited, but only the outside of the envelope was examined. The address was in the handwriting of the Confederate chief, and the statement of our young adventurer that it was merely a letter of recommendation advising Messrs. Clay and Thompson that they might repose confidence in the bearer, since he was ardently devoted to the Confederate cause and anxious to serve the great purpose that it had in view, appeared entirely probable; and the young man was allowed to proceed to Niagara Falls and Canada. He made some general report upon the condition of the rebel army at Gordonsville, but it was of no particular value, except that in its more interesting features it agreed with our information from other sources.

He was not long in returning from St. Catherine's with a despatch which was also allowed to pass unopened, upon his assurance that it contained nothing of importance. In this way he went back and forward from Richmond to St. Catherine's once or twice. We supplied him with money to a limited extent, and also with one or two more horses. He said that he got some money from the Confederates, but had not thought it prudent to accept from them anything more than very small sums, since his professed zeal for the Confederate cause forbade his receiving anything for his travelling expenses beyond what was absolutely necessary.

During the summer of 1864, the activity of Grant's campaign, and the fighting which prevailed all along the line, somewhat impeded our young man's expeditions, but did not stop them. All his despatches, however, whether coming from Richmond or from Canada, were regularly brought to the War Department, and were opened, and in every case a copy of them was kept. As it was necessary to break the seals and destroy the envelopes in opening them, there was some difficulty in sending them forward in what should appear to be the original wrappers. Coming from Canada, the paper employed was English, and there was a good deal of trouble in procuring paper of the same

appearance. I remember also that one important despatch, which was sealed with Mr. Clay's seal, had to be delayed somewhat while we had an imitation seal engraved; but these delays were easily accounted for at Richmond by the pretence that they had been caused by accidents upon the road, and by the necessity of avoiding the Federal pickets. At any rate, the confidence of the Confederates in our agent, and in theirs, never seemed to be shaken by any of these occurrences.

Finally our despatch-bearer reported one day at the War Department with a document which, he said, was of extraordinary consequence. It was found to contain an account of a scheme for setting fire to New York and Chicago by means of clock-work machines that were to be placed in several of the large hotels and places of amusement, particularly in Barnum's Museum in New York, and to be set off simultaneously, so that the fire department in each place would be unable to attend to the great number of calls that would be made upon it, on account of these Confederate conflagrations in so many different quarters, and thus these cities might be greatly damaged, or even destroyed.

This despatch was duly sealed up again and was taken to Richmond, and a confidential officer was at once sent to New York to warn General Dix, who was in command there, of the Confederate project. The general was very unwilling to believe that any such design could be seriously entertained, and Mr. John A. Kennedy, then superintendent of police, was equally incredulous. But the Secretary of War was peremptory in his orders, and when the day of the incendiary attempt arrived both the military and the police made every preparation to prevent the threatened catastrophe. The officer who came from Washington was lodged in the St. Nicholas Hotel, one of the large establishments that were to be set on fire, and while he was washing his hands in the evening, preparatory to going to dinner, a fire began burning in the room next to his. It was promptly put out, and was found to be caused by a clock-work apparatus which had been left in that room by a lodger who had departed some hours before. In every instance these fires were extinguished without much damage and without exciting any considerable public attention, thanks to the precautions that had been taken in consequence of the warning derived from Mr. Clay's despatch to Mr. Benjamin in Richmond. The plan of setting fire to Chicago

proved even more abortive ; I do not remember that any report of actual burning was received from there.

Later in the fall, after the military operations had substantially terminated for the season, a despatch was brought from Canada signed by Mr. Clay and addressed to Mr. Benjamin, as Secretary of State in the Confederate Government, conveying the information that a new and really formidable military expedition against northern Vermont, particularly against Burlington, if I am not mistaken, had been organized and fitted out in Canada, and would make its attack as soon as practicable. This was after the well-known attempt upon St. Alban's and Lake Champlain, and promised to be much more injurious. The despatch reached Washington one Sunday morning and was brought to the War Department as usual, but its importance in the eyes of the Confederate agents had led to its being prepared for transportation with uncommon care. It was placed between two thicknesses of the pair of reënforced cavalry trousers which the messenger wore, and sewed up so that when he was mounted it was held between his thigh and the saddle.

Having been carefully ripped out and opened, it was immediately carried to Mr. Stanton, who was confined to his house by a cold. He read it. "This is serious," he said. "Go over to the White House and ask the President to come here." Mr. Lincoln was found dressing to go to church, and he was soon driven to Mr. Stanton's house. After discussing the subject in every aspect, and considering thoroughly the probability that to keep the despatch would put an end to communications by this channel, they determined that it must be kept. The conclusive reason for this step was that it established beyond question the fact that the Confederates, while sheltering themselves behind the British Government in Canada, had organized and fitted out a military expedition against the United States. But while the despatch afforded evidence that could not be gainsaid, the mere possession of it was not sufficient. It must be found in the possession of the Confederate despatch-bearer, and the circumstances attending its capture must be established in such a manner that the British Foreign Office would not be able to dispute the genuineness of the document. "We must have this paper for Seward," said Mr. Lincoln. "As for the young man, get him out of the scrape, if you can."

Accordingly the paper was taken back to the War Department, and sewed up again in the trousers whence it had been taken three hours before. The bearer was instructed to start at dusk on the road which he usually took in passing through the lines; to be at a certain tavern outside of Alexandria at nine o'clock in the evening, and to stop there to water his horse. Then information was sent through Major-General Augur, commandant of Washington and the surrounding region, to General Wells, of New Hampshire, the military governor of Alexandria directing him to be at this tavern at nine o'clock in the evening, and to arrest a Confederate despatch-bearer concerning whom authentic information had been received at the War Department, and whose description was furnished for Wells's guidance. He was to do him no injury, but to make sure of his person and of all papers that he might have upon him, and to bring him under a sufficient guard directly to the War Department; and General Augur was directed to be present there, in order to assist in the examination of the prisoner, and to verify any despatches that might be found.

Accordingly, just before midnight a carriage drove up to the door of the War Department with a soldier on the box and two soldiers on the front seat within, while the back seat was occupied by General Wells and the prisoner. Of course no one but the two or three who had been in the secret was aware that this gentleman had walked quietly out of the War Department only a few hours previously, and that the paper which was the cause of the entire ceremony had been sewed up in his clothes just before his departure. General Wells reported that, while the prisoner had offered no resistance, he was very violent and outrageous in his language, and that he boasted fiercely of his devotion to the Confederacy and his detestation of the Union. During the examination which now followed he said nothing except to answer a few questions, but his bearing, patient, scornful, undaunted, was that of an incomparable actor. If Mr. Clay and Mr. Benjamin had been present, they would have been more than ever certain that he was one of their noblest young men. His hat, boots, and other articles of his clothing were taken off one by one. The hat and boots were first searched, and finally the despatch was found in his trousers and taken out. Its nature and the method of its capture were stated in a memorandum which was drawn up on the spot and

signed by General Augur and General Wells and one or two other officers who were there for the purpose ; and then the despatch-bearer himself was sent off to the old Capitol Prison.

The despatch, with the documents of verification, was handed over to Mr. Seward for use in London, and a day or two afterward the warden of the old Capitol Prison was directed to give the despatch-bearer an opportunity of escaping, with a proper show of attempted prevention. One afternoon he walked into my office. "Ah," said I, "you have run away !" "Yes, sir," he answered. "Did they shoot at you ?" "They did, and didn't hit me ; but I didn't think that would answer the purpose. So I shot myself through the arm." He showed me the wound. It was through the fleshy part of the forearm, and due care had been taken not to break any bones. A more deliberate and less dangerous wound could not be ; and yet it did not look trivial.

He was ordered to get away for Canada as promptly as possible, so that he might explain the loss of his despatch before it should become known there by any other means. An advertisement offering two thousand dollars for his recapture was at once inserted in the New York *Herald*, the Pittsburg *Journal*, and the Chicago *Tribune*. No one ever appeared to claim the reward ; but in about a week the escaped prisoner returned from Canada with new despatches that had been intrusted to him. They contained nothing of importance, however. The wound in his arm had borne testimony in his favor, and the fact that he had hurried through to St. Catherine's without having it dressed was thought to afford conclusive evidence of his fidelity to the Confederate cause.

The war was ended soon after this adventure, and, as his services had been of very great value, a new place, with the assurance of lasting employment, was found for the young man in one of the bureaus of the War Department. He did not remain there very long, however, and I don't know what has become of him. He was one of the cleverest creatures I ever saw. His style of patriotic lying was sublime ; it amounted to genius.

C. A. Dana.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE FAILURE OF THE JURY SYSTEM.

CHANCE stands at the threshold of the jury system, as jurors are selected by lot, regardless of their ability to weigh close questions of fact. Ignorance follows in the footsteps of chance, since the man who has formed opinions upon the topics of the day is liable to challenge.

The system by its operation forces a man from his bank or store, his farm or mill, and brings him into a court-room to decide a question upon the evidence as introduced in writing or by witnesses. Not accustomed to the place, he wonders at all that passes around him. In what state of mind is he to intelligently listen to and decide a question that may involve the financial interests of his neighbor or the life of a fellow-man? If a man whose time is of value, he cannot be expected to give close attention to the evidence when his thoughts have wandered to his business and he chafes beneath an imprisonment which may be of great damage to him. Men's opinions are influenced by their surroundings. Such a man is not in a condition to render intelligent and impartial verdicts.

Some argue that the good of the public should influence men to sacrifice their personal advantage, so that the able business and professional men of the land, whom no one would dare to approach with a bribe, might consent to serve on juries. Granted that this ought to be the case: but what ought to be is one thing; what is, quite another. All men ought to behave themselves, and then we would have less occasion for juries; but they will not do it.

We are viewing this question just as it now is, and not in the light which fancy may picture.

It is conceded and deplored that the men who are the best qualified to sit as jurors, if drawn, make some pretext which the court deems a sufficient excuse for them. Their places are filled by the incompetent. However, disregarding the danger of corruption and assuming that juries are composed of men of average intelligence, is it to be expected that they will render just verdicts?

From the very nature of the system, no.

In its infancy trials were very brief, one day, perhaps, being sufficient for the longest, and the interests involved were limited in importance. Then men of average intelligence could grasp and retain the material points in the evidence, at least until they had reached the jury-room. To-day trials run into months, so that before a case has been half-completed nearly all

that has gone before is either a perfect blank to the majority of the jury or has become so confused that it is impossible for them to unravel it.

One never sees a member of a jury make a note of any of the points in evidence. Unaccustomed as he may be to memorizing numerous facts, he is expected to store in his memory for weeks or months all that the witnesses may say—a palpable impossibility.

Again, with an advancing civilization come new and varied interests, vast in proportions, which must be determined not by mere guesswork, but by men trained in weighing questions of moment and sifting the essential from the rubbish. Millions are to-day involved where hundreds once figured. To cope with all these conflicting questions requires more than the training acquired by a man on the farm, in the coal mine, the store, or the workshop. It needs men who by habits of life and thought have acquired the faculty of analyzing a proposition and deducing a correct conclusion and not a guess. Men of this class are not found—it is not expected that they will be found—among those who are drawn by chance.

No member of a jury is expected to know anything about the law applying to the case, but still, with millions of property or perhaps a human life at stake, he is expected to apply the law to the facts, and sits for his first lecture. That the long and learned instructions of the court fall by the wayside is only too evident, demonstrating the absurdity of a system that presumes them to be of value.

Confusion of law and fact is the result. You might as well call twelve men to the bedside of a sick man, and, after they had heard the facts as to his condition from the lips of the patient, the nurse, and his family, with instructions or a lecture from the attending physician sitting as judge, let them retire to a jury-room, there determine what afflicts the patient, and so inform the physician, who, like the judge, must then give the medicine according to the verdict.

Ten hundred and sixteen jurors were called and fifty-three days consumed before a jury was secured to try the Cronin case in Chicago, and the trial lasted one hundred and seven days, at an enormous expense; while eight men are under indictment for tampering with that jury.

The residents of New Orleans waited a month for the end of the trial of the Mafia, and then took fifteen minutes to accomplish what a jury by bribery or intimidation failed to do.

Chicago cannot afford to spend her time and money in trying a case under a system which but manufactures new criminals when attempting to convict the old.

The city of New Orleans should not be compelled to appall the civilized world by meeting crime with crime, at a great cost of time and money.

But waste of time and great expense are only slight incidents in comparison with the most glaring absurdity of the system—the rule requiring unanimity in the jury.

How difficult it is for two men of equal intelligence to draw the same conclusion from facts stated! Much more difficult it must be to call twelve men of different occupations, manners, and degrees of intelligence, and require them to think as a unit.

When the unanimity of twelve men was first required, a jury was composed of those who had personal knowledge of the question in dispute and were only witnesses. The rule was that twelve persons should be found who would agree upon a verdict. It was simply the amount of the evidence

that was the spirit of the rule. Modern practice limits the number to twelve, making them a mere machine. Why the number twelve? Why should twelve be more capable than six? Why unanimity in finding a verdict when we trust a majority of the legislature to enact laws, a majority of the judges in a higher court to interpret them, and one man to enforce them? Unanimity breeds stubbornness, resulting in disagreement or an unreasonable verdict. Unanimity puts it in the power of one man to render worthless the result of weeks of labor and time of the court, attorneys, parties, jurors, witnesses, and all connected with the administration of justice. Further, it opens the door to corruption, since one out of twelve can be more easily bribed than a greater number.

We pass the fact that this system cannot but have a demoralizing effect upon practitioners at the bar, encouraging sophistry and chicanery, the inconsistency of allowing a jury to find a verdict and then permitting a court to set it aside, and call attention to that feature which in modern times threatens the very foundations of all government. It is the disregard that certain members of a jury may have for laws which conflict with their personal interest or against which they have a prejudice. The most notable are the laws on the liquor and Sunday questions. No matter how guilty the defendant, it is seldom that a jury will agree upon a conviction, thus practically repealing the laws through the prejudice of perhaps one man.

Leave the same questions to a court, and it would not dare to openly nullify the law, no matter what might be its personal feeling. It is the individual responsibility placed upon courts and their natural regard for all law that insure its proper administration by them. It is the lack of regard by certain jurors for all law that does not suit their fancy, and the screen which the secrecy of the jury-room affords, that make it possible for this abuse to exist. If the laws are unjust, a rigorous enforcement of them will effect their repeal by the proper authority; but so long as they do exist, that instrument, the jury, which is supposed to aid in carrying them out, should not be permitted to render them fruitless through the violation of the oath of one of its members.

Now that some of the faults of the system have been examined, it might be asked, what shall take its place? The answer is, a bench composed of a reasonable number of judges, three or five, who receive their office for life, by appointment.

First, there should be more than one judge, that he may be aided by the counsel of his associates, and so avoid the least suspicion of favoritism or prejudice.

Second, the court should receive its position by appointment and should not be composed of members of one political party, so that the administration of justice may be taken out of politics and its corrupting influences.

Some fear corruption through this plan. With it should come liberal laws for inquiring into the acts of such judges, and their removal if unfit. By paying them well for their services you at once remove the greatest motive that can corrupt any man, and place them in a position where they can be unmindful of public opinion.

Others argue that a bench of judges is too far removed from the common affairs of life to be able to decide questions of fact; seeming to forget that, as a rule, our judges have risen from the humblest walks of life, and have come into personal contact with the varied affairs of men. Men when they become judges do not necessarily lose their common-sense. Instead of being less

competent than an ever-changing jury, they are the better qualified to judge of facts, since cases involving the same or similar questions will occur time and again, giving them knowledge by experience.

By this plan you no longer place a premium on ignorance, and you secure what is the prime object of every suit, allowing every one to assert his rights speedily, with the least expense and the highest degree of certainty.

CHARLES A. THATCHER.

A TERRIBLE POSSIBILITY.

"Now a bubble burst, and now a world."

OVID says that while Jupiter made the body of the brute to extend horizontally, its face looking upon the ground, he made man to stand erect, his gaze fixed upon the stars. This may have been the original intention, but if we may trust that most faithful of all mirrors, the daily press, the gaze of the average modern man would be better accommodated by the horizontal than by the erect position of the body. The gems which stud the heavens may be brighter and more numerous than those which lie buried in the ground, but they are not so available as collateral.

Now and then, however, the heavenly bodies assume a negative value which commands the attention of other men than astronomers. Some far-off star explodes, involving its retinue of planets in stupendous ruin. Why may not a similar fate befall our own star, the sun? Then what would become of us and our collateral? The possibility of such a catastrophe invests the sun with a sudden dignity and importance, which the beneficent glory, the unmenacing splendor, of ages could not give him. The common eye is momentarily lifted from the ground; even the daily newspaper honors the grand old luminary with a column or two. This is most apt to follow upon an especially active period of spots, with the consequent meteorological disturbances, like that which has recently occurred.

Science has delivered us from the terrors which afflicted the childhood of our race. Comets, those hobgoblins of the skies, and eclipses, those frightful feints of the angry gods, no longer blanch the faces of men. But for every imaginary terror she has banished, science has revealed a real danger. Microbes and bacteria replace the malevolent sprites of the water and the air; and in the spectacle of the actual conflagration of systems, men have forgotten their childish fear of comets and eclipses. The ghosts of the night have gone, but the sword, bullet, and torch, so to speak, of the day have come.

As we have asked, why may not our sun explode, or burst forth suddenly into such overwhelming intensity of radiation that the earth and all her sister-planets shall be shrivelled like insects in a glowing furnace? It would be an insignificant casualty in the universe, the extinguishment of but a single spark in the all-pervading fire.

Change is the law of all physical being. Nothing is immortal but the ultimate atom. The sun and its planets had a beginning: they must have an end. When will that end come? Not for many æons yet, we hope. But though we all hope to die at a good old age, some of us must die to-morrow. If to-night the astronomer descries some remote system "into ruin hurled," to-morrow night may see our own sharing the same fate.

This is possible, but not probable. Though death is the destiny of all, monads, men, and worlds alike, as a rule it does not come without ample

warning. In the vast majority of cases it is preceded by unmistakable symptoms. So far has spectroscopic science advanced that it is able to classify stars very much as medical science classifies men, into the "healthy," the "doubtful," and the "dangerous." Our sun, we are rejoiced to learn, is rated among the "healthy." Its eleven-year periods of spots are not the morbid intermittence of fever, but the natural pulsations of its great, glowing heart.

Even if its intensity of radiation should rise far above the usual maximum, it would not necessarily be destructive of planetary life. Tyndall has shown by a series of more than a thousand experiments that an extremely slight change in the constitution of the atmosphere would make a very great difference in its heat-absorbing and heat-transmitting power. A little increase in the average amount of watery vapor held in suspension, for instance, would change a tropical to a temperate climate. In its oceans, therefore, the earth has a shield against the fiery darts of her great lord and master. If they should grow too fierce, like a woman she would quench them with *salt water*.

We may therefore contemplate the dangers to which the solar system is exposed with the same calm unconcern with which the man in robust health contemplates his own possible untimely demise.

E. P. JACKSON.

"GREATER NEW YORK."

THE question of creating a huge American city with the island of Manhattan as its centre, which was under consideration at the recent session of the New York Legislature, is one of more than local importance. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that it is a question of national interest.

If the plan agreed upon by the commission appointed in 1890 to consider the subject should be adopted and carried into effect, "Greater New York"—as the projected city is sometimes rather magniloquently called—would surpass Paris in point of population, and would rank second only to London among the great cities of the world. It is indisputable that there would be something agreeable to American pride in an achievement with such a result.

But there is another consideration of no small moment in the minds of not a few persons. It is evident, taking into consideration the rapid growth of Chicago as shown by the last census, that it will not be many years before that marvellous metropolis of the West comes into close competition with New York on the score of numbers. When that time is at hand, it is confidently expected that a wonderful impulse in the direction of consolidation will make itself felt, and that New York and all its environs will make haste, by the process of wholesale annexation, to ward off the threatened calamity of the removal of the country's most populous city from the Atlantic seaboard to the prairies of the West.

The bill prepared and reported by the commission already mentioned was passed by only one branch of the Legislature of the present year; but the commission still remains in existence, and will doubtless prepare another measure for presentation to the next Legislature. The matter is now fairly before the public,—though profound interest in it seems to be confined to a small group of persons,—and the agitation is likely to be kept up until something like an authoritative decision of the question is arrived at. The pass-

age of this year's bill, however, would by no means have meant the consolidation forthwith of the cities, towns, and country districts around New York with that metropolis.

Before proceeding further let us inquire into the scope and purpose of this measure. It simply authorized the members of the commission to "prepare and submit to the Legislature a charter for the incorporation, government, and administration of a city to comprehend" the city of New York; the county of Kings, which includes the city of Brooklyn; the whole of Richmond County (Staten Island); a portion of Westchester County lying directly north of the present northerly boundary of New York city; and a considerable section of Queens County, on Long Island, including Long Island City, which adjoins Brooklyn on the northeast. This combined municipality was to be known as the city of New York, and its government and administration were to be vested in one chief executive officer and two legislative boards; the several municipal administrative departments to be, as far as possible, each under a single head.

It may be frankly admitted that the project is one that appeals to sentiment and the imagination rather than to the practical judgment. The burden of proof lies, of course, with the advocates of consolidation. There are no evidences of any strong popular sentiment in favor of the commission's plan, or of any plan—though no other has been formulated—for bringing about the same result. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the general feeling on the subject is that, while New York is quite willing to take its neighbors to its ample breast, the question is not for New York to decide, but should be left to the determination of the several communities which are asked to sink their identity in the greater mass of the metropolis. That Brooklyn, for instance, is willing to give up its name and autonomy, and become no more than an outlying district of New York, is one of the things that the friends of annexation have as yet failed to prove. The questions that naturally arise in the minds of Brooklyn people when the subject is opened are: What have we to gain by consolidation? Are we to have any lower taxes? Are we to get a better local administration? What compensation are we to receive beyond the merely sentimental one of being citizens of the second largest city in the world? It must be admitted that these are practical, even vital, questions; and no satisfactory answer to them has been given.

The weak point in the American system of self-government is the government of cities. As that keen-sighted and philosophic observer Professor Bryce has said: "There is no denying that the government of cities is the one conspicuous failure of the United States. The deficiencies of the National government tell but little for evil on the welfare of the people. The faults of the State governments are insignificant compared with the extravagance, corruption, and mismanagement which mark the administration of most of the great cities. For these evils are not confined to one or two cities. . . . There is not a city with a population exceeding 200,000 where the poison germs have not sprung into a vigorous life; and in some of the smaller ones, down to 70,000, it needs no microscope to note the results of their growth."

Now, if this is the case with the cities that we already have,—and undeniably it is so,—what would be the result of creating a city once-and-a-half as large as the largest that now exists in America? Would it not be merely to multiply the evils that have already had so rank a growth? This is a question that must give the consolidationists pause. So far is the problem of

municipal government from being solved, and so notoriously bad is the administration of New York at present, that the thought of properly governing a city nearly twice as large is nothing short of appalling.

Nor is there any assurance that the already overburdened taxpayers of the cities adjacent to Manhattan Island would find any relief in being swallowed up by their big neighbor; while it is almost certain that the residents of the rural communities which it is proposed to absorb would find their burdens on this score sensibly increased, without any corresponding advantages. And, furthermore, there is the danger that the annexed municipalities and districts might not receive wholly fair treatment in the matter of expenditures and improvements if they should intrust their fate to the tender mercies of New York, which would necessarily control the purse-strings of the future city.

After all, the main question is whether Brooklyn, Long Island City, Staten Island, etc., desire to be added to New York. Without doubt New York would not refuse to take them in should they come knocking at its doors. To compare a thing not small with one greater, the situation is very much the same as that of Canada in its relation to the United States. Our people are generally agreed that they will make no effort to capture what Mr. Wiman is never weary of calling the "greater half of the continent"; and they are likewise generally agreed that as soon as a movement toward annexation comes from Canada, the United States stands ready to do its part towards enlarging its borders on the north.

So it is, or, at any rate, ought to be, with New York and its neighbors. The movement toward consolidation should proceed not from it, but from them. Thus far they have shown almost no desire in that direction. A popular vote on the subject in Brooklyn, for example, would in all probability disclose a very large majority in favor of retaining that city on the map of the Empire State. The failure of the bill in the Legislature a few months ago provoked no lamentations. Consolidation is, in fact, the *fad* of a few men who are fond of publicity and of posing as benefactors of their generation.

EMERSON PALMER.

HARNESSING THE RAIN-CLOUD.

IT IS wonderful in how many different directions, all at once, scientific realities are superseding ignorant superstitions. We laugh at the predictions of the alarmist who fixes the date of the world's destruction by a tortured interpretation of some Scriptural cryptogram, but the facts of solar physics have a bearing upon the subject which is no laughing matter. The Indian believes that his big medicine-man can open and shut the flood-gates of the heavens at his pleasure, and some of his white brethren still hold a similar belief—a belief that Tyndall has so irreverently ridiculed in his famous challenge.

But though science can admit neither big medicine nor prayer among her "motors," though neither has any demonstrable physical connection with the atmosphere or the clouds, the same cannot be said of the agencies with which General Dyrenforth is experimenting under the patronage of the government. He proposes to bring down the rain, not by charms or incantations, but by perfectly natural means—the simultaneous or serial explosion

of immense volumes of oxygen and hydrogen, mixed in due chemical proportion, and sent up in balloons to greater or less elevations, according to the hygrometric condition of the aërial strata. Thus far the attempt has been, not actually to produce a rainfall, but simply to test the elevating and exploding apparatus used, and more especially to reduce its expensiveness within the practicable limit. When this shall have been satisfactorily accomplished, the next step will be to try the experiment on a sufficiently large scale to produce the desired effect—*i. e.*, at times and places when and where it would be reasonably certain that there would otherwise be no rainfall, such as, for example, the arid districts of Kansas and the Texas Panhandle, or possibly parts of the western coast of South America, where such a phenomenon as a fall of rain is scarcely known.

No atmospheric air in its natural condition is without a certain amount of watery vapor held in suspension. It is, of course, only necessary to bring a sufficiently great pressure to bear upon it to force precipitation of its moisture in the form of dew, mist, hail, snow, or rain. Even the scorched air of the great African desert has its "dew-point," and if it could be suddenly reduced to this temperature, there would be—what probably has never been seen since the continent took on its present form—a terrific thunderstorm in the desert of Sahara!

The abundant rains which almost invariably follow earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, great battles, great conflagrations, and the widespread concussions of Independence Day long ago suggested the possibility of human control over the elements. Not until the course of experiments now in progress, however, have any really energetic or promising attempts been made in this direction.

A popular belief is that on the occasions which have been named, battles, volcanic eruptions, etc., it is merely the tremendous concussions which cause the precipitation of rain; that the moisture is held in a sort of equipoise, from which it is thrown as a shower of walnuts is brought down by shaking the tree! In fact, however, the effective cause is the sudden condensation of the air from a reduction in its temperature. The heat generated by the explosions of gunpowder, oxyhydrogen gas, etc., great as it is, is utterly insignificant in comparison with the cold produced by the sudden expansion of their gases. The principle may be easily illustrated by sprinkling the floor of a hall on a hot day with boiling water. Notwithstanding the heat of the water, the room is speedily cooled by its evaporation.

WALTER J. GRACE.

ARE WE ANGLO-SAXONS?

IN PROPORTION as the North American republic grows powerful and overshadowing, grows the anxiety of Englishmen to have it understood that this potent factor in the world's affairs is what they term Anglo-Saxon; that it is Anglo-Saxon in race, feeling, and literature. Matthew Arnold, Goldwin Smith, Edward A. Freeman, and James Anthony Froude, all British Chauvinists, are the most distinguished advocates of the idea—an idea received with enthusiasm by some here in America, with indifference by others, but by a large section of our people with dislike, because it is false and because it is offensive. Those great writers are Englishmen who see more or less clearly into the future. They see that the day is surely coming when England will have to take her place behind the American republic, and they would

like their countrymen coming after them to be able to say: "What does it matter, after all, whether it be the elder or younger branch of the Anglo-Saxon race which shall influence, perhaps sway, the world's destinies and shape its literature and civilization, provided it be Anglo-Saxon?"

While Governor-General of Canada, the Marquis of Lorne never wearied of glorifying the Anglo-Saxon. The idea ran through most of his speeches; he was never so happy as when congratulating his mother-in-law's subjects on the fact that they were part and parcel of the imperial race that many enthusiasts assert has sprung from the lost tribes of Israel. And yet the noble marquis is himself heir to the chieftaincy of a great Celtic tribe, and will be the McCallum More on the death of the Duke of Argyll. In addressing Canadians in such a strain, his lordship was absurd, inaccurate, and unphilosophical. Had he taken time to think, he would have realized that the people he called Anglo-Saxon were Celtic, even as the Campbells themselves. The leader of the Canadian Government in his time was Sir John A. Macdonald, whose name speaks for itself; his lieutenant was the French Sir Hector Langevin; the leader in opposition the Scottish Celt Alexander MacKenzie, and his second in command the French Wilfred Laurier. One-third of Canada's population is French—that is to say, Celto-Latin; one-third Irish and Highland Scottish, and the remaining third of English and German descent. The marquis was about as ethnologically correct in addressing Canadians as Anglo-Saxons as was Mr. Blaine in his letter accepting the nomination for the Presidency in 1884, when he drew a distinction between the two Americas by terming one of them Spanish and the other Anglo-Saxon.

Is it necessary, in order to escape the trouble of disputing over an unscientific expression, that Irishmen, for instance, should tacitly admit the Anglo-Saxon to be something like a proprietor of these United States and representative of a race aristocracy? What about the descendants of Frenchmen, of Germans, of Slavs, and of Scandinavians, who do not admit Anglo-Saxon superiority? When, overpowered by his emotions, the average Fourth-of-July orator eulogizes the Anglo-Saxon, he does not pause to consider that the Celts and Germans among his audience may inquire of one another if there is any room on this continent for them. It may flatter the vanity of the orator and a portion of his hearers to have it admitted that they, the race aristocracy of the land, are allied in blood to the Anglo-Saxon on the other side of the Atlantic who rules so mighty an empire, or, merely exulting in his ignorance, he may imagine that every white man is an Anglo-Saxon. The writers who sit calmly down with white paper before them and thinking pens grasped in their fingers—and there are thousands of them—have not the same excuse, and yet they ring the changes on the Anglo-Saxon idea in and out of season.

There are several ways of arriving at a fair approximation as to what race the American people really belong to or are descended from; among them names, language, immigration, figures, and features. Now, while there can be no question that the English language is all but universally spoken in the United States and Canada, it is spoken as eloquently and sonorously by the Irish-American Daniel Dougherty, the French-American Chauncey M. Depew, the German-American Carl Schurz, as by the Anglo-Saxon American Henry James or John Sherman. Seven or eight millions of African descent also speak the English language, but they do not claim to be Anglo-Saxons.

It is probable that after the fall of Louisburg, when England became supreme in that part of North America not controlled by Spain, the Anglo-Saxon element largely predominated, though, of course, coming in contact all over with hundreds of thousands who were of Spanish, French, Dutch, or German origin, not forgetting Irish, which race must be always kept distinct from the English or Anglo-Saxon as a different—nay, unfortunately a hostile—element. Now, for purposes of ethnological classification, and lacking accurate data, we say of Russia that it is Slav, of Germany that it is Teutonic, of Ireland that it is Celtic, and of England that it is Anglo-Saxon. This is language of the roughest and loosest kind, as each of those countries has more or less of a mixed population, and England most of all. Still it must serve for want of better. We have to begin somewhere, and it is just as reasonable to call an Irishman a Celt as to call an Englishman an Anglo-Saxon.

When the first census of the republic was taken, in 1790, the white population was found to be 3,172,006. Assuming that all English are Anglo-Saxon, what was the proportion of that element in the number? I consider 2,000,000 a liberal allowance, and so take that figure as a basis for argument, more for its roundness than because it may be correct. Supposing, then, that those two millions had received no accession of strength from extraneous sources, to what number would they have increased, let us say, up to 1880? Unfortunately no one can say. There are in existence no statistics showing the natural increase of the American people. The answer would be simple enough were it not for the immense volume of immigration from Europe, Canada, Mexico, and other American countries between the years 1820 and 1880, containing upwards of ten millions of souls who intermingled with the American people and became part of the national life.

In order, therefore, to arrive at anything like a fair conclusion as to what may be termed the present value by natural increase of the original 2,000,000 Anglo-Saxons, it will be necessary to have recourse to analogy. There is one element in the United States which has received no increase worth speaking of in immigration, and that is the African. It is known that in 1790 the colored population, bond and free, was 757,208, and in 1880, 6,580,793; which is an increase of 770 per cent. in ninety years. Now, if the 2,000,000 Anglo-Saxons increased in the same ratio, their number in 1880 would have reached 15,400,000. As a matter of fact, the colored population increased more in proportion than the Caucasian until within a very recent period; but as we are moving over hypothetical grounds, let that not interfere with the argument.

The next question to be answered is, To what extent has the Anglo-Saxon benefited by immigration from the mother-land? Mr. Ainsworth Spofford, the librarian of Congress, informs us that between 1779 and 1820 the immigration to this country is estimated to be 250,000, of which for obvious reasons the Anglo-Saxons formed a very small percentage. After 1820 we have official figures at our disposal, and tread on more solid ground. From Mr. Spofford's returns I find that from 1820 to 1879 (both years inclusive) 9,908,709 immigrant from Europe and British America settled in the United States. The subjoined figures show the nationality of those immigrants: England, 894,444; Ireland, 3,061,761; Scotland, 159,547; Wales, 17,893; Great Britain (not specified), 560,453; Austro-Hungary, 65,588; Belgium, 23,267; France, 313,716; Germany, 3,002,027; Greece, 385; Italy, 70,181; Netherlands, 44,319; Poland, 14,831; Portugal, 9,062; Russia, 38,316; Spain, 28,091; Scan-

dinavia, 306,092; Switzerland, 83,709; British America, 568,941; other countries, 97,007; miscellaneous (unknown), 255,778.

It will be seen from these figures that England alone furnished less than a tenth of this volume of immigration; but allowing half of the Scotch contingent to be Anglo-Saxon and a fourth of the Canadians to be of the same race, the sum would be 1,115,450, which added to the 15,400,000 above would make a total of a little over sixteen and a half millions in 1880, plus the natural increase of the immigrants, which, if set down at half a million would allow the people of Anglo-Saxon blood in this country in that year to be 17,000,000, or about seventeen forty-fourths of the white population. I do not take the 560,453 immigrants from Great Britain (not specified) into this account, as I believe they were Irish and other Europeans. It is well known—the "Encyclopædia Britannica" is authority for it—that the English Immigration Bureau kept track of English emigrants proper sailing from English ports, while as for others it often did not take the trouble to classify them according to nationality. Since 1880 upwards of 7,000,000 immigrants from Europe and British America have entered the United States, chiefly from Germany, Scandinavia, Ireland, and Italy, and relatively few from England; and at this present moment the most liberal estimate could not allow more than 18,000,000 of Anglo-Saxon blood in the country.

The features of the people resemble the Celto-Latin races more than the Anglo-Saxon or Teutonic. The average Englishman is fair; the average American dark; the face of the average Englishman inclines to flatness; that of the American is sharp and aggressive, with a Celtic contour.

Names furnish little or no indication of race. Names, whether German, French, or Irish, get translated or anglicized with ease and rapidity. Thus Schmidt and Jansen change to Smith and Johnson after a generation: Lemarch, Dubois, Leblanc, and Lenoir are translated into Walker, Wood, White, and Black; and the Irish names Callahan, Mahoney, and Greehan are modified to Calhoun, Mahone, and Green. As was stated in an article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for October, 1886, Europe, not England, is the mother of America, and, this being so, we should all be content with our Caucasian origin and American citizenship, and we should be proud to see even in this generation a type developing itself which is destined to pass into the future as essentially American, as different from Celtic as from Latin, as different from Anglo-Saxon as from either—a type which while still new will so spread and assert itself as to render impossible a Cossack or Chinese destruction of the world's civilization.

JOHN C. FLEMING.

DORCHESTER BRANCH.
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXVIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1891.

GOLDWIN SMITH AND THE JEWS.

BY ISAAC BESHT BENDAVID.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH is an amiable, an attractive, and, as I had always till now supposed, an accurate writer. Although he is an Englishman by birth, he does not seem to share the insular prejudices of so many of his countrymen in favor of those aristocratic institutions of which England is the most highly developed modern type.

Great, therefore, is my surprise to find Mr. Goldwin Smith arraying himself, in the cosmopolitan pages of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, with the persecutors of the Jewish race, and lending the authority of his name to the propagation of what I must ask his permission to describe as impressions at once unfair and unfounded in regard to the relations of the people of Israel with the nations of central and of eastern Europe. To do this at any time would be to serve instincts and traditions with which it should be impossible for any true liberal of the nineteenth century to sympathize. To do this at a time when every steamer which arrives from the continent of Europe brings its contingent of Jewish men, women, and children, seeking in the new world a refuge from the injustice of the old, is surely to gladden the heart of the oppressor and to darken the faces of the oppressed.

It was a beautiful thought of the great French sculptor, Bartholdi, himself a scion of the chosen people, to embody the homage

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE, All rights reserved

of European freedom to American institutions in a colossal image of Liberty enlightening the world; and it was a thought not less beautiful which moved another son of Israel, himself an American citizen, to provide the means whereby this noble image has been set in the very gateway of America, there to welcome and to cheer the exiles of all lands. Certainly it is not from this radiant Pharos of hope and of progress that Mr. Goldwin Smith has derived the "new light" which he professes to shed upon the Jewish question.

I shall have no trouble, I think, to show Mr. Goldwin Smith himself, if he be, as I willingly believe him to be, a disinterested seeker after truth, that this "new light," like many other "new lights," is by no means a light from heaven, and that it has led him far astray. More than this, I shall be able to show him that it is not in any sense a "new light" at all. It is, on the contrary, an old obscuration of a very old question.

"The general belief," Mr. Goldwin Smith begins by telling us "has been that the anti-Semitic movement is religious, and that the Jews are being persecuted, as they were or are assumed to have been in the dark ages, on account of their faith." "Such was the tenor," he goes on to say, "of all the manifestoes, speeches, and editorials in which British indignation against Russia found vent after the anti-Semitic disturbances of 1880. Everybody said that the dark ages had come again, and that the murderous atrocities of mediæval fanaticism were being reënacted in the nineteenth century." Whereupon Mr. Goldwin Smith proceeds to enlighten the general mind by assuring us, in the first place, that "persecution is not the tendency of the Russian or of the church to which he belongs," and, in the next place, that the Jews are hated and assailed, not only in Russia, but in Austria, in Germany, in the Balkan states, and "even in the Ionian Islands," not because they cling to the religion in which the founder of Christianity was born and trained, but because they refuse everywhere to live the life of the country in which they dwell, or to support themselves and their families by productive industries. It is to "economical and social," not to religious, causes that he would have Americans attribute the expulsion, by popular violence or administrative tyranny, of thousands of Jewish families from their homes, the practical confiscation in many cases of all their property, and the complete uprooting in all cases of large com-

munities from the lands in which these communities have dwelt for long years, necessarily contributing to the resources and necessarily bearing their share of the burdens of the commonwealth.

These are very serious things to say. This is a very grave indictment to frame against a whole race; for no exceptions are made. Our accuser does not content himself with an attempt to exculpate the Russian authorities. He formulates his general accusation in a manner which must compel impartial and logical persons who accept his views to the conclusion that the Russian authorities deserve not blame, but praise, for their determined effort to expel the race of Israel from the dominions of the Czar. To believe this is to believe—is it not?—that all other governments ought to imitate the government of Russia. If the influence exerted by the Jews upon the economical and social life of Russia has been such as to warrant their removal *en masse* from the empire, is it tolerable that so pestiferous a population should be planted in other countries?

"The explanation of the whole trouble, and of all the calamities and horrors attending it," we are told by Mr. Goldwin Smith, after he has cited a number of British consular reports imputing usurious and mischievous practices to the Jews in certain Russian towns, "is that the Jews are, to adopt the phrase borrowed by Vice-Consul Wagstaff from natural history, a parasitic race. Detached from their own country, they insert themselves for the purpose of gain into the homes of other nations, while they retain a marked and repellent nationality of their own."

This is the core of the whole matter, according to our accuser. The Jews are "a parasitic race." So convinced is Mr. Goldwin Smith of this that he goes into an elaborate argument, with which I will not just now deal further than to refer my readers to his own statement of it, in order to show that "parasitism" is inherent in the very nature of the Jew. I must do our accuser the justice to say that he grows vague and misty when confronted, by his own conscience, with the necessity of giving some plausible account of the origin of this very peculiar "parasitism" of a race which produced not only the prophets and the psalmists of Israel, but the Christian apostle upon whom we are told the world-embracing church of Christianity was founded as "upon a rock." "Its principal cause probably," he tells us, "was the narrowness of the Jewish territory combined with the love of gain in the

Jew." I will not stop to point out that the great Napoleon founded upon precisely similar premises his celebrated indictment of the race of which Mr. Goldwin Smith is so distinguished an ornament, as "a nation of shopkeepers." But when Mr. Goldwin Smith goes on to strike at the Jew over the back of his "near kinsman, the Phœnician"; to draw support for his imputation of "parasitism" against the Jew from a contrast between the "mercantile" colonization of the Phœnician and the "nobler colonization of the Greek"; and to aver that the parasitism of the Jews drew upon them the shafts of "the Roman satirist" long centuries ago, I cannot refrain from inviting my readers to remember that it was not a Jew at all, but a "needy Greek"—*Græculus esuriens*—of whom the "Roman satirist" alleged that his greed would make him even undertake to fly. It was not as a parasitic shopkeeper bent on usurious profits, but as a mystic believer in the ineffable truths of a lofty spiritual faith, "commercing with the skies" for God and not for gain, that the Jew—"*credat Judæus Apella*"—invited the polished contempt of the worldly-minded and epicurean "Roman satirist." Ought a Christian scholar of the nineteenth century to forget the homage paid by Augustus Cæsar to the spiritual faith and civic virtue of his Jewish subjects? Or is Mr. Goldwin Smith, in his zeal for the "derabbinization" of the Jews, really ready to turn into derision the heroic martyrdom of Israel under Caligula?

"The Jew is now detested," we are calmly told, "not only because he absorbs the national wealth, but because, when present in numbers, he eats out the core of nationality." If this were true, Baron Hirsch, of whose "philanthropic zeal" Mr. Goldwin Smith, in his ardent desire to see eastern Europe rid of a "parasitic race," speaks in loud words of commendation, would deserve, not commendation at all, but the sternest reprehension. How can a man be called a "philanthropist" who seeks to introduce into Australia, into America, into the Argentine Republic, and that "in numbers," a parasitic race destined and doomed by nature not only to absorb the national wealth, but to eat out the core of nationality from among whatever people may be cursed by its presence?

But this is not true.

It is precisely the contrary of this which is true. Frederick the Great was no lover of the Jews as Jews any more than of

Englishmen as Englishmen. His "general privilege" issued to the Jews of Prussia in 1750 reeks with intolerance and political bigotry. With his own hand this royal admirer of Voltaire struck out the name of Mendelssohn, which all Germany, and, indeed, all Christendom, unites to honor to-day, from the list of his great Berlin Academy. But Frederick the Great was a mighty ruler of men, and broadened the foundations upon which his descendants have built up the foremost European power of our times. And it was Frederick the Great who laid it down as an axiom that "to oppress the Jews has never brought prosperity to any government." Was this because the prince of royal sceptics believed the oppression of the Jew would be avenged by the God of Israel? Certainly not! It was because the shrewdest and most indefatigable of royal observers had learned that in every state in which they find themselves compelled to establish their homes the children of Israel, adhering to the precepts of their great lawgiver and enlightened by the wisdom (Talmudic or Karaitic) of their forefathers, have always been found to be a source of strength, not of weakness. He found them everywhere not absorbing, but increasing, the "national wealth"; not "eating out the core," but building up the body, of every nationality to which they have contributed their vital force.

Had the Jews "eaten out the core" of the nationality of Spain when, twenty years after the conquest of England by William the Norman, they drove the Moors forth from "the city of generations," the Jerusalem of the West, and established the throne of Alonzo *el Emperador*? Where had been the deathless glory of the Cid, Rodrigo de Bivar, the Campeador of Spain and the bulwark of Europe, but for the Jews of Toledo? What Spaniards did Spain better service in that marvellous twelfth century than the Spanish Jews who laid the pavements of La Blanca in soil brought from Mount Zion, and who framed of cedarwood from Lebanon that lofty and noble ceiling which still delights the artist and the architect, though ages have passed since the brave and loyal heirs of the builders were hounded to destruction by the savage Vincente Ferrer, in order that the mob might pillage their homes—even as Pedro the Cruel before them had plundered the treasury of his wisest councillor and tortured to death the faithful servant he had robbed? Does not Mr. Goldwin Smith know that to this day, in Servia, in Macedonia, in

Rumania, in Bulgaria, the descendants of the exiled Jews of Spain, driven forth from the land they had done so much to redeem and to enrich, still proudly call themselves Spaniards; still preserve the speech of Spain; still cherish in their eastern homes the memories of a heroic past in western Europe? Does he not know that the Hebrew newspaper which represents the ideas and the interests of the Hebrew race at Salonica bears the Spanish name of the *Epoca*?

Nay, let me ask Mr. Goldwin Smith to look into the annals of the Hebrew race in his own country and in his own time. He will find that the Jews of England, down to the very eve of the Reform Bill, clung to the use in their religious services of the language of Spain. It was only in 1829, and after a most earnest and critical debate, that the loyalty of the Hebrew exiles to the language of Samuel Levi and of Benjamin of Tudela could be shaken by the persistent efforts of men like Moses Montefiore and N. M. de Rothschild, who were anxious to see English patriotism encouraged among the Hebrew residents of England by a complete identification of the Jew, in all his social and political rights, with the Protestant and the Roman Catholic subjects of the British Crown. The English Jews consented to adopt the English tongue in their synagogues long before other Englishmen could be brought to grant to the English Jews the full rights of citizenship. Does not Mr. Goldwin Smith know that the wonderful career of the most illustrious Englishman of our times would have been impossible to him had not his father abjured the religion of his ancestors? Benjamin Disraeli was able to enter Parliament in the springtime of his life because he was able to take the oath of allegiance "on the faith of a Christian." How long did the Liberals of the city of London beat in vain at the door of the House of Commons, demanding to be represented there by a great financier and a high-minded English citizen who could not and would not take that oath?

Mr. Goldwin Smith rebukes the Jews of eastern Europe for adhering to that rite of the circumcision which, as he must assuredly know, is not confined to Jews alone, has prevailed, and prevails, throughout the world from Arabia to Australasia, and from South Africa to Central America, and cannot with any sort of accuracy be called a "tribal" custom. Doubtless Spinoza, who stands alone among philosophers, as does Newton among men of science, or

Pascal among thinkers—doubtless Spinoza was right when he said that the rite of circumcision would maintain the integrity of the Jewish household of faith. The highest medical authorities of our day maintain that it has also kept up the vigor and vitality of the race. I suppose the Protestant Baptists are right in maintaining the rite of immersion as essential to the maintenance of their sect, and the Quakers in maintaining the custom of wearing the hat; but is an American Baptist less trustworthy as an American because he insists upon immersion? Were William Penn and George Fox less trustworthy Englishmen because they wore the hat where others doffed it? Will Mr. Goldwin Smith aver that Sir Moses Montefiore and N. M. de Rothschild were less loyal and patriotic Englishmen, being circumcised children of Israel, than Benjamin Disraeli, who, adopting under his father's roof the religion of the English Church, rose to the highest place among the statesmen of England and of the world as Earl of Beaconsfield?

The most famous and the most popular English writer of fiction of this century, Charles Dickens, was certainly not the less truly an Englishman in his local and national sympathies because he came of a Hebrew family. Would his place in fiction have been other or lower than it is had he adhered to the faith of his ancestors and undergone all the rites of their religion? Is the renown of George Eliot tarnished by her loyalty to the genius of Israel?

Mr. Goldwin Smith must permit me to ask him whether he does justice to his own reputation for candor and for learning when he charges it upon the Jew as a Jew that "he changes his country more easily than others." Are we not at this moment dealing with a "Jewish question" the urgency of which is due to the simple fact that the Jews of Russia and of other countries in eastern Europe cling to the countries in which they have dwelt, and are driven forth from them, not by their own "greed of gain," as Mr. Smith rashly puts it, but by the prejudices of an ignorant peasantry and the policy of autocratic governments? As I have already shown, it is the characteristic of the Jewish race to cling to the soil of the land in which it has been planted. For this reason, in all times and countries the policy of all who hated the Jew has been to forbid him to own or to till the soil. When Portuguese bigotry drove the Jews from the banks of the

Tagus to those of the Garonne, the Jews transplanted to France still called themselves the "Portuguese nation." Under that name they demanded the rights of citizenship from the First Republic in 1791—rights which, by the way, the First Republic would have refused them but for the eloquence and energy of Mirabeau and of Rabaut de St. Etienne.

"When the Southern Confederacy fell," Mr. Goldwin Smith tells us, "its leaders generally stood by the wreck and did their best for those whom they had led, but Judah Benjamin went off to pastures new." Is this sneer an argument to prove the Jewish race incapable of patriotism? Is it worthy of the pen which has indited it? Is it even decently fair to the distinguished lawyer, statesman, and orator at whose grave it is levelled? Surely Mr. Goldwin Smith must know that Judah Benjamin was the companion of Jefferson Davis in that southward hegira from Richmond the true object of which was to raise again, beyond the Mississippi, the fallen banner of the Confederacy. Surely he must know the story of that hegira. Surely he must know how it came to pass that the little band was broken up and scattered. Had not Louisiana, the American home of Judah Benjamin, been made a wilderness for him and for his family long before the fall of the Confederacy? Does not Mr. Goldwin Smith know that Judah Benjamin, born a British subject in Jamaica, and driven from his adopted land at an age when most men would have thought the making of a new career beyond their force, courageously took up the profession of the law in the very metropolis of his mother-country, and there won for himself, by energetic toil, the foremost position at the English bar? "Pastures new!" Nay! Judah Benjamin sought no pastures fat and easy of access! Driven from the home he had made in the new world, he delved in the most difficult of mines, and died overworn with work, though not till his work had been rewarded by a success which reflects honor not on himself alone, but on the Jewish name and race.

I must ask Mr. Goldwin Smith to remember that when Judah Benjamin was born a British subject in Jamaica the English bar was closed to Englishmen of Jewish race. I must ask him to remember that it was only in 1833 that a young Jewish student and gentleman was permitted by English prejudice and proscription to take his place at the English bar; and I must appeal to his candor to admit that the names of Sir Francis Goldsmid, of Sir

George Jessel, of Lord Herschel, and of Judah Benjamin can never be omitted by any historian of the English bar from the roll of honor of English jurisprudence. And before I pass from this point I must, furthermore, protest against the airy assumption that Judah Benjamin alone represented the Jews of America in the dark days of the Civil War. On both sides in that cruel conflict the American Israelites stood shoulder to shoulder with their fellow-citizens of all other races and creeds. The Mordecais, the Cohens, the Levys, the Florences of the South did their duty, as they understood it, to the sovereignties which claimed their immediate allegiance. Had the advice of Mr. Memminger, of South Carolina, an Israelite by race, though not by religion, and a colleague in the Confederate Treasury of Judah Benjamin, been taken at the outset of the conflict, I have been assured the issue of the struggle might have been other than what it actually was; nor have I ever heard that, when the war was ended (happily, as I think) in the victory of the Union, any Southern Israelite who was suffered to remain in his own State failed to "do his best" for his country. On the other side, what soldiers of the Union earned more honor by their loyalty and their valor than Lyon and Rosecrans? What Northern financier was more energetic in support of the national credit than the Belmonts and the Seligmans?

The numbers of the American Jews have always been exaggerated. There is no good ground for believing that they exceeded 100,000 at the outbreak of the Civil War, or less than one-third of 1 per cent. of the total population of the United States in 1860. The rolls of the War Departments of Washington and of Richmond will show what proportion the Jewish soldiers on either side bore to this scanty percentage.

I must leave Mr. Goldwin Smith to reconcile his denunciation of the Jew as a "parasitic" creature who "eats out the core of nationality" with his admission, in another place, that the Jew "always and everywhere" has been "a conforming citizen" who has "refused none of the burdens of the state." To me the statements appear to be absolutely inconsistent one with the other; nor does it much help them that Mr. Goldwin Smith thinks it fair to qualify the admission by adding that the Jew has always made "the burdens of the state" "as light as he could." This may be said with equal truth, I venture to

think, of all men. I have yet to hear of any race or sect of men addicted to demanding habitually the privilege of paying more taxes than their fellow-citizens. But how long is it since the odious "Leibzoll," or body-tax, was exacted throughout Germany of every Jew, not once in a year, nor once in a month, but whenever he came into or went out of a city gate, though it might be ten or twenty times a day?

The first real equality of civil rights given to the Jews in Germany came to them with the establishment by Napoleon of the kingdom of Westphalia. At that time the Jews constituted less than one-half of 1 per cent. of the population of Germany,—they constituted no more than 1 per cent. of the population of the empire in 1875,—and such had been the social and political restrictions imposed on them in Germany for ages that no one could have been surprised had they everywhere cast in their lot with the French liberator of their race against their oppressive and intolerant Teutonic fellow-citizens. What actually came to pass when Germany rose against Napoleon after the repulse of the expedition against Russia? The Jews of Germany remembered only that they were Germans. As Germans, they took the field and gave their blood freely for the German Fatherland. But what was their reward? After the crowning victory of the allies in 1815 every German Jew who had won a commission in the armies by his valor and his skill was suddenly deprived of it, and faced the alternative of serving in the ranks or leaving the army altogether! It was in this way that the German rulers of the Holy Alliance set about promoting that amalgamation of the Jews with the rest of their subjects which Mr. Goldwin Smith seems to imagine that nothing has ever prevented but the stiff-necked "tribal" exclusiveness of the children of Israel!

And this took place, observe, years after the Jews, assembled in the great Sanhedrim of Strasburg, had commanded the Jews of France to acquire landed property as a means of training them "to be better Frenchmen," and had ordained that Jews serving in the national armies should be absolved during their term of service from the "ceremonial duties" of their religion!

Is it the opinion of Mr. Goldwin Smith that the object of the Jews who, of their own motion, deliberately established such a decree as this was to "eat out the core of nationality"? If Mr. Goldwin Smith will look into the history and the enact-

ments of the great council of 1807, he will find therein more and more achromatic "light upon the Jewish question" than he has been receiving from the official reports of British vice-consuls charged to report upon the repetition in various regions of eastern Europe of phenomena as old and as familiar as the instincts of prejudice, jealousy, and greed which have produced them.

Of these consular reports Mr. Goldwin Smith makes use, with little or no attempt to examine them critically. He makes long citations, for example, from the reports of Mr. Wagstaff, without telling us that Mr. Wagstaff is established as British vice-consul at Riga, far away from the great centres of the Jewish populations in Russia, and in the midst of a population predominantly German and commercial. In 1840 the Jews were forbidden to dwell in any Livonian city except Riga, and in Riga only 100 Jewish families were permitted to dwell. Mr. Wagstaff is now quoted to prove that a system of "boycotting" exists among the Jews of Bessarabia! This is as if the report of a British vice-consul at Portland, Maine, should be cited in Rome to illustrate the origin of the alleged "massacre" of Italians in New Orleans. Mr. Wagstaff says of the Bessarabian Jews: "They use their religion for business purposes. This is expressed by the words 'koul' or 'kagal.'" This doubtless means the "Kahel" under which the Israelites have stood together in matters affecting their interests from time immemorial. To confound it with the essentially aggressive and tyrannical practice of "boycotting" is to show equal ignorance of the one and of the other. If Mr. Goldwin Smith will consult the decrees of the Sanhedrim of 1807, he will find that in matters of interest and profit the Jews are commanded to treat all their fellow-men as they treat one another. They are forbidden to take usury of any man. They are forbidden to take advantage of any man. They are forbidden even to take interest on loans made for the support of a family. On these and kindred points I am sure every well-informed Jew will agree with me in asking Mr. Goldwin Smith to make the fullest and freest inquiry into what he contemptuously calls the "tribal morality" of the Talmud.

If he will make the inquiry, I venture to say he will no longer talk about the "Karaitic" as purer and loftier than the "Talmudic" morality. Indeed, he seems to imagine, as did the Protestant controversialists of the sixteenth century, that the word "Karaite" stands for Protestant and the word "Talmudic" for

Roman Catholic; and it may perhaps surprise him to learn that of the three millions of Jews in the Russian Empire, not more certainly than one-third of 1 per cent. belong to the Karaitic communities, which exist chiefly in the Crimea. Perhaps his friend, Dr. Sandwith, who seems to have studied the Jewish question chiefly in the Crimea and within the walls of Kars, may have misled him into this curious overestimate, both of the moral elevation and of the importance of the Karaitic sectarians. I do not dwell on this, for I have no quarrel with Mr. Goldwin Smith. My only object is to protest against dangerous and bewildering misrepresentations of the "Jewish question," which may do serious mischief at a time when thousands of Jews, expelled from their homes in eastern Europe, are seeking a land of peace and of liberty on this side of the Atlantic. Curiously, the decrees banishing all the Jews of Spain were issued in the very year, 1492, which saw the discovery of America made under the Spanish flag. I do not think the fourth centennial of the expedition of Columbus ought to be celebrated by an organized attempt to exclude the Jews from the new world which he found.

Oddly enough, the cable now announces the outbreak at Elizabethgrad of a local persecution precisely like that which occurred at the same place in 1881. Now, as then, the authorities allow, if they do not inspire, the outbreak, which spares neither Karaite nor Talmudic Jews who have any property worth looting!

The "Jewish question," like other "questions," has many sides. Vice-Consul Wagstaff, studying it at Riga, where the Jews are neither numerous nor very influential, takes it upon hearsay that in regions of Russia where the Jews are both numerous and, through their activity, influential, they exercise a commercial tyranny over the peasantry, earn thereby the hatred of the peasantry, and are thereupon persecuted by the authorities. Doubtless in many parts of agricultural Russia, where the Jews, not being allowed to own land, have been driven out of agriculture into trades and dealing in money, they have behaved no better than other people in similar circumstances have elsewhere behaved. The complaints made of the Jews in Poland, for example, where the vast majority of them live in villages and towns, are almost identical with the complaints made of the "gombeen men" who in Ireland monopolize trade in the rural districts

and control the small farmers by lending or advancing money to them. I have heard complaints of a similar kind made against the "capitalists" of the eastern United States, in the far West.

In Hungary and the Danubian states similar complaints led, a quarter of a century ago, to a "Juden-hitze," or system of "Jew-baiting," as bitter as any now raging. The object of the system then was to drive the Jews into Russia, that other money-lenders and traders might take their places. Long before this, under Nicholas I., the Russian Government set afoot a persecution of the Jews in western Russia and Poland for the purpose of compelling the Jews along the frontier to remove either into Germany or into the interior of the Russian Empire. The famous "deportation ukase" of April, 1844, excited feelings of sympathy and indignation throughout western Europe. Under it hundreds of thousands of Jews were commanded to sell all they had within a very brief period, and leave their homes forever. The ukase led to an earnest remonstrance from the Jews of England, and to the celebrated visit which Sir Moses Montefiore made in the winter of that year to Russia, where he pleaded the cause of Israel personally before the Czar Nicholas, as some years before he had pleaded the cause of the Jews of Damascus and Syria before the Sultan. The main pretext of the persecutions of 1844 and 1881 was that the Jews along the frontier engaged extensively in smuggling, just as the main pretext of the persecution of 1891 is that the Jews in the rural regions engage extensively in trades not always of an elevated kind, and in money-lending not always on the most liberal principles.

In 1844 and 1881, as in 1891, the real motive at the bottom of the persecution is a political motive. It is the desire of the Pan-Slavist leaders and agitators to expel all non-Slavonic elements out of Russia. The Jews are ready and willing to be Russians. They are not, however, Slavs, nor can they be amalgamated into Slavs. In 1844 Nicholas had Jewish soldiers in his guards, and admitted to Sir Moses Montefiore that they were loyal, brave, and excellent soldiers. In 1891 the removal of the Jews is a blow aimed indirectly, but distinctly, at the Germans. Many of the Jews in western Russia are of German origin. Through the "Kahel" all of them may maintain intimate business relations with the Jews of Germany, and by their existence and prosperity as Jews in Russia the German element in Russia, which the Pan-

Slavists are bent on stamping out, is more or less continually reënforced. In 1844 the Czar Nicholas candidly admitted to Sir Moses Montefiore that the accusations levelled at the Russian Jews would not, for the most part, hold water, but he expressed his wish frankly to get them all out of the empire.

In 1891 Germany, which in 1844 was the vassal, has become the rival, of Russia. The policy of Prince Bismarck was to encourage the court chaplain, Stocker, and other German fanatics into a "Jew-baiting" in Germany, which should drive more Jews out of Germany into Russia, and thereby strengthen the subterranean connections between the Russian Empire and central Europe. Since the retirement of Prince Bismarck the Russian Pan-Slavists, who are preparing to Russianize eastern and central Europe in due time, have set on foot a "Jew-baiting" among the Slavonic nations and tribes. They are willing, as were the Russian authorities in 1844, that the Jews should prosper—but not in Russia! In 1844 Count Kisseleff civilly, but cynically, assured Sir Moses Montefiore that he cared not what became of the then existing generation of Jews. "In a century," he said, "the Jews may be educated and good Russians. But I do not care about the Jews now. I only care about the Jews of a century hence!"

Can the Jews of to-day be blamed for caring for themselves? When, in 1561, Cardinal Comendoni went as nuncio from the Pope to King Sigismond, of Poland, he found the Jews of Wilna enjoying equal rights with other Poles. He found them landed proprietors, wearing swords, holding public offices, and he loudly praises—he a Catholic and a cardinal coming from the city of the Ghetto—the system under which the Polish children of Israel were thus enabled to show themselves what their ancestors were in the Holy Land at the time of the Roman Conquest,—tillers of the soil as well as traders, valiant in arms, skilful in the arts, and equal to all the duties of civilization. Even to this day the traces of that better age are visible in the superiority of the Jews of Wilna to their brethren in adjoining circles of the Russian Empire.

When we see what great work the Jews of Europe have done despite the depressing influence of ages of restriction, injustice, and oppression, what may not be hoped from the Jews of America! That the Jew is by nature as well fitted for the du-

ties of a husbandman, or of a sailor, or of a soldier, or of an artisan, as for those of a trader or a money-changer, any Christian may satisfy himself by simply taking a concordance of the Scriptures, old and new, Jewish and Christian, and referring to the occupations therein cited. He will find that the occupations of the Jews when they possessed Palestine were at least as various as the occupations of the English under Elizabeth can be shown to have been by a concordance of Shakespeare. What was the command of the Lord of Hosts to the Jews who were deported from Jerusalem into Babylonia? "Build to yourselves houses, and dwell therein; till your gardens, and eat of the fruit thereof." Have not the Jews of our own day faithfully obeyed this command ever since they found a refuge in New Jersey from those persecutions, "not religious," of 1880 and 1881, in the course of which Professor Röhling, of Prague, was not ashamed to charge Sir Moses Montefiore, then in his ninety-ninth year, with encouraging "the sacrifice of Gentile maidens at the Passover"? Has Mr. Goldwin Smith forgotten that this same atrocious calumny was levelled at the Jews of Damascus by a "consular officer"—not English, indeed, but French—no longer ago than in 1847?

That the Jew is by nature gifted above many other races of men it does not become me to assert. But such is the concurrent testimony of the ages of Christendom, the very existence of Christianity being itself a witness to the assertion. Granting the Jew to be only the equal, intellectually and morally, of other men, what right or reason has any man to affirm of him that by a law of his nature his presence as a citizen, enjoying equal rights with other citizens, in a land of liberty and of plenty, must prove a blight, and not a blessing, to that land and to all its inhabitants, of whatever lineage and of whatever faith?

ISAAC BESHT BENDAVID.

A PLEA FOR RAILWAY CONSOLIDATION.

BY COLLIS P. HUNTINGTON, PRESIDENT OF THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY.

THE question has often been asked of railroad men, What is the remedy for rate wars and the demoralization that results from the rate-cutting incident to their business as at present conducted? I know of but one answer to this question, and that is consolidation or joint ownership; and as the solution of a purely business problem I began advocating this many years ago. The process of consolidation itself (which is simply the endeavor to secure the largest possible amount of tonnage and transport it with the least expenditure of money) is a logical outgrowth of circumstances, and, although the projectors of the earlier lines did not perhaps foresee the advantage, and even the necessity, of it, yet it was not long before the natural tendency of railroad corporations towards unification of interests began to manifest itself.

There are men now living in the full activities of life who have travelled from Albany to Buffalo over the Albany and Schenectady, Schenectady and Utica, Utica and Syracuse, Syracuse and Auburn, Auburn and Rochester, and Rochester and Buffalo railroads, all of which were connected in a continuous line of track. But it was very soon discovered by the proprietors of these fragments of roads, so to speak, that they gave little return to their owners, while the result to the people who used them was unsatisfactory, as it was difficult to get through rates of freight and, when obtained, to locate the responsibility for damage to property, or for detention in transit from the point of shipment to destination.

The disadvantages arising from this lack of unity have induced a continuous effort from that date to the present time, on the part of the builders of railroads, to devise ways by which the people could be better served and the owners more satisfactorily compen-

sated for their risks and outlays of capital, until the ablest men have come to the conclusion that the most effective, and probably the only practical, remedy for the many evils and demoralizations that now exist is joint ownership, as it would appear that only in that way can the minimum of cost of transportation, and, therefore, the maximum benefit to the public and to the roads, be secured ; and this, too, to use the words of Lincoln, "not rending or wrecking anything," but, instead of this, creating harmony out of discord, order out of confusion, and largely increasing the value of the property of the stockholders of each road, each of whom thus becomes a stockholder in the whole property.

Thus came into existence the present New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, from which the general public has reaped enormous advantages, while the owners have been rewarded by an exchange of shares of little or no worth for stock in the new organization, of vastly increased value. This great corporation may be said to represent the genius of that giant of railway finance, Cornelius Vanderbilt, whose keen foresight, indomitable will, and tireless energy combined to produce this example of railway enterprise.

The same may be said of that vast network of roads controlled by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, which has been slowly but steadily built up by purchase and consolidation, by the interweaving, as it were, of many short roads of little or no value into the completed fabric known as the Pennsylvania system. To the organizing force and intellect of Edgar Thompson and, after him, of Colonel Thomas A. Scott, is due this unparalleled achievement in the history of railway-building. That the owners and managers of these and other large corporations of their kind have been able to continue the success that was guaranteed by the sagacious policy of their predecessors reflects no less credit on the earlier actors than it does upon their successors, who were quick to perceive the wisdom of the policy and mentally equipped to carry it out.

When both of the great systems alluded to were in the process of amalgamation they were severely criticised ; but I think no one will at this time dispute the fact that both of the organizations, as at present constituted, serve, and are able to serve, the people better than it was possible for the fragmentary sections of which they were composed to have done, and that they, moreover, give

much better returns to those who have invested their capital in them. As Sidney Dillon has well said in the April number of THE REVIEW, "Combinations that do not combine, and monopolies whose constant tendency during a long series of years has been to bring producers and consumers into closer relations with each other and lessen the cost of living to both, deserve praise and support rather than censure and adverse legislation."

That this merging of several properties into single organizations is a natural process of improvement is shown, also, by the fact that it is all the time going on and never takes a step backward; and we have yet to learn of a single instance where it has been considered advisable, either by those financially interested or by the public, to disrupt a system thus consolidated and restore it to its original parts, or to make any part independent of the others. Nor has the writer ever known of a consolidation that has not brought a reduction of rates, except where there had previously been such a cutting of rates as would inevitably have landed the property into the hands of a receiver, with all its evil results to both the owners and the public, had not sagacious councils arrested the impending ruin.

It is not for the interest of the public that property wisely created and capable of so much good to the country should be used in such a way as to invite bankruptcy, for by such mismanagement many needed improvements will not be created. There are a few individuals in every community, and probably always will be, who spend their lives in the effort to find some place where they can take up something without laying anything down, and to whom wasteful, and I might almost say wicked, competition among railroads is welcome, so long as it affects favorably their own individual pockets. From these people opposition to legitimate transactions that are based upon the principle of giving the greatest good to the greatest number may always be expected; but I am satisfied that the mass of the intelligent people of the country look with disfavor upon the unhealthy strife between the railroads of this country, which has resulted not only in no permanent good to the patrons of the roads, but in irreparable harm to vested interests and the interruption of that process of development of the country's resources the advance of which, under a more enlightened policy, should be steady and rapid.

The time was when people were afraid of corporations and

looked upon them with jealousy and distrust; but the history of the world's industry has, I think, taught the majority of the people that corporations are the means whereby the multitude can combine for mutual benefit and protection. In no other way can they compete with the vast capital that is concentrated in the hands of a few individuals; and, this being so, the time should, and I believe will, soon come when communities will call for the same treatment of corporate property that is accorded to individual possessions. Then railroad corporations will not be unjustly interfered with in the exercise of their rights, based upon the most obvious rules of business, by such legislation as culminated some years ago in the Inter-State-Commerce Act.

It should be possible for the railroads to move the product of the farm and the lean ores of the mine at a small profit over train expenses, and thus develop large and important interests, as well as accommodate a large number of men by giving them employment that cannot be obtained when the rates on freight are arbitrarily fixed by law so that these products of the farm and the mine cannot be moved to a market that will take them. The great expense of operating a road of light traffic, the construction of which has been somewhat costly, consists not in the actual expense of running the trains themselves,—which includes only the wear of the track and machinery, the consumption of fuel, oil, and waste, and the wages of the crew,—but in the fixed charges, in which are included the interest on the cost of property, the taxes on the same, and the maintenance of the different departments connected with its management.

Where the price of moving a ton of ore is compulsory, whether ore be rich or lean, the rich will be sent to market and the poor will remain at the dump, instead of being removed, and thus possibly opening a path to richer and more remunerative beds of ore; and in the case of forest products, the fine timber will be profitably taken out, without interfering with the profits of the lumberman, while the cheaper stuff will not be handled. Lean ores and cheap timber should be moved at a small profit over the actual train expenses, but this cannot be done under the present law. I believe the Inter-State-Commerce Act has caused the loss of millions of dollars to the producer, as it would seem evident that no manager of a railroad would fail to bring out over his line tonnage of this character, the marketing of which means so many dollars to the

lumberman and the mine-owner, employment to many who must otherwise remain unemployed, and the encouragement of worthy industries. These things are so apparent that they should be understood by all.

With many of the railroads of America, which run through large areas of arid country, the problem of existence is a hard one, and the only apparent solution is to secure something out of the bowels of the earth that will bear transportation; and, upon the theory that there is something for man's use everywhere, it should be found here in the form of ores, possibly lean ores; but so long as they will pay something over train expenses, their transportation may provide much work for men and some remuneration to those who carry them.

The railroads known as the overland or Pacific railroads have lost much business because of their inability, on account of the Inter-State-Commerce Law, to compete with the Canadian Pacific, which is able, through the fostering care of a paternal government, unrestricted by legislation, to bid for business on better terms than its American rivals. The struggle between the different companies is not for the interest of a majority of the people who use the railroad, as the very large shippers at the great competing points reached by two or more roads get an immediate benefit from the reduction of rates, while the small dealers are injured in their business to a very considerable extent. Assume that a hundred men are dealing in some particular commodity. Ninety-nine of them may each have a car-load, or less, to ship, which is not enough to make it an object for them to go and "shop" among the different transportation companies for rates; and if they did, the tonnage is not enough to make it an inducement for the companies to cut the rate in their favor; but one man who has, as is sometimes the case, five hundred car-loads to ship is vitally interested, and he accordingly goes about among the various roads until he finally succeeds in obtaining the desired rebates. This not only takes money from the railroad itself, but does great harm to the small shippers, who are crowded out of the market or compelled to sell their product at less net profit than they are fairly entitled to. The shippers who live along the line away from these competing centres are compelled to pay more, as the sums lost at the competing points must be recouped to prevent the railroad company from going into bank-

ruptcy, as very few of the small roads of the country are paying anything beyond their current and fixed expenses, leaving nothing for the holders of the shares.

What possible remedy is there for such a state of things except joint ownership? As a simple business proposition, it seems to me unanswerable, for, by its application, it can be readily seen that much of the expense of maintaining separate organizations and separate offices will be cut off, and a great multitude of agents and agencies will be dispensed with. On the side of the people quite as much good will be the outcome. The complaint of charging more for a short than for a long haul, which comes from the shipper located between instead of at the important centres, will cease to be heard, because the pernicious system of giving rebates and commissions, or whatever they may be called, that cost the roads so much money and really do their patrons, as a whole, so much harm, will no longer be practised, the excuse or necessity therefor no longer existing.

While the uniting of small roads has been productive of great benefits to the owners and to the public who use them, yet I am satisfied that the best results will not be reached until substantially all the transportation business of this country is done by one company. The accomplishment of this would reduce the cost of transportation to the minimum, which would admit of the lowest possible rates to shippers and passengers. There would be no longer any necessity of charging more for a short than for a long haul, except where water competition existed, as the crossing of railroads at various points would have no further effect upon the rate schedules.

The raising of rates at non-competing points is one of the things done by railroads which it is hard to explain to the satisfaction of those who buy transportation; but it will continue to be done as long as railroads are controlled by scattered interests, and neither agreements nor laws will entirely prevent it. If, on the contrary, all the railroads of the country were held in joint ownership, they would need much less rolling-stock than is now required, as the great staple crops of the country are moved at different seasons of the year, and cars and locomotives could be transferred from one section to another as needed, thus saving a large amount of capital which otherwise, for a considerable portion of the year, would be idle.

There is another feature of this question that is perhaps hardly taken into account in the public mind, because its bearing upon it appears, at first glance, to be remote; but we are dealing with a problem of the future, and the time is coming when its close relation to it will be appreciated. The existence of an undoubted security for institutions and for the great mass of conservative investors of limited means, who demand above all other qualifications a security that shall be safe, and who rely upon their investments for the incomes which are to support themselves and their families, is soon to become a necessity in America. Our government bonds are constantly being called in and cancelled, whilst the surplus capital of the country is continually increasing. Unless a stable and safe security for the multitude is forthcoming, it does not need the astuteness of a financier to comprehend the possible situation of the future when the investor who seeks an assured income from his savings will have to place his reliance upon the wisdom of his own selection among a list of many hundreds of railway stocks and bonds, subject to all the serious fluctuations that follow in the wake of selfish competition and inefficient management.

The writer has never regarded the existence of a large national debt as an evil in a prosperous and growing country like the United States, whose obligations do not affect the credit of the government and are not significant of any financial embarrassment; but our people have decided otherwise, perhaps not unwisely; nevertheless there must be a substitute for the people to invest their savings in—a security that shall possess the confidence of the entire public. What shall it be? It seems to the writer that nothing will be safer than shares or bonds of the united railroads of this country, and few, if any, other securities will be so easy to negotiate or raise money on. If this is true, why should not a very large number of the people who use these roads invest their money in such an organization, and thus become, to a large extent, the owners and controllers of the railroads that they use?

Ours is a vast country, and no doubt produces more and a greater variety of food for man than any other nation on the earth. All are interested—those who produce and those who consume—in having the enormous tonnage of food gathered and distributed at the lowest possible cost. How to do it is the question that all want to see solved. It was once believed by many,

and it may still be thought by a very few, that if the farmer had no machinery for reaping, sowing, and gathering his grain, many would get employment and thereby be helped, even if it cost something more to produce. Is there any one who would be benefited by having the transportation cost more than the least possible sum for which the product of the farm could be moved? If that be so, let us all look for that way. It cannot be done by little fragmentary companies, for they cannot practise the economies of wealth, as their poor road-beds, crippled rolling-stock, and lean management will testify. What is wanted is not more than two or three—and one would be better—great carrying companies, with their steel tracks and road-bed as nearly perfect as they can be, with all their machinery of the best quality, with their capacious warehouses at intermediate points, and their almost unlimited terminal facilities. With the best talent in the country to manage and control such an organization, many millions could be saved to those who use the railroads of this country, and millions also to those who own them over what is now being received by the fragmentary, badly-equipped, and inefficiently-managed roads that, with but few exceptions, now exist.

Some fears have been expressed that the great transportation companies of this country would override the rights of the people; but surely there need be no apprehension of that, as certainly there is no danger. Any capitalist, or combination of such, would be weak—yes, worse than weak—to make the effort to stand between the people and their rights, and I am quite sure that few honest and intelligent citizens fear any such combination. To be sure, there are demagogues who cry "Monopoly!" and assert that the great corporations are about to override the liberties of the people; but solicitude for the people is not the real reason of their outcry. It is because they hope to climb up on the noise they make into high places, and into seats that they are not worthy of and have not the ability to fill.

The branch of the government in which all good people have faith,—the sheet-anchor, so to speak, of all we hold dear,—the judicial department of the government, will stand between the rights of the many and the few, and—what is even more important, because the danger is greater—will see that the rights of the few are protected against the improvident, and hence impecuni-

ous, many. The rights of all should be and, I believe, will be protected. If not all, very soon none.

In the great trial of Warren Hastings, Edmund Burke, addressing the House of Lords, is reported to have said: "It is well for you to remember, gentlemen, that if the time should ever come when British law does not protect the life, the liberty, and the property of the humblest Hindoo upon the banks of the Ganges, no nobleman will be safe on the banks of the Thames."

Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court, lately delivered an important address that should be read by every American citizen; and amongst other things he said:

"Public attack upon private property appears conspicuously under the guise of regulation, where charges for the use are so reduced as to prevent a reasonable profit on the investment. The history of this question is interesting. Certain occupations have long been considered of a quasi-public nature—among these, principally the business of carrying passengers and freight. Of the propriety of this classification no question can be made. Without inquiring into the various reasons therefor, a common carrier is described as a quasi-public servant. Private capital is invested, and the business is carried on by private persons and through private instrumentalities; yet it is a public service which they render, and by virtue thereof public and government control is warranted. The great common carriers of the country, the railroad companies, insisted that, by reason of the fact that they were built by private capital and owned by private corporations, they had the same right to fix the prices for transportation that any individual had to fix the price at which he was willing to sell his labor or his property. After a long and bitter struggle, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the celebrated 'Granger' cases, reported in 94 U. S., sustained the power of the public and affirmed legislative control.

"The scope of this decision, suggesting a far-reaching supervision over private occupations, brought vigorously up the question as to its extent. On this line the struggle was again renewed and carried to the Supreme Court, which in the recent case of Railway Company *vs.* Minnesota, 134 U. S. 418, decided that regulation did not mean destruction; and that under the guise of legislative control over tariffs it was not possible for State or nation to destroy the investments of private capital in such enterprises; that the individual had rights as well as the public, and rights which the public could not take from him. The opinion written in that case by Justice Blatchford, sustained as it was by the court, will ever remain a strong and unconquerable fortress in the long struggle between individual rights and public greed."

What has been said in this article of those who deal in the products of the forest and mine applies to an even greater extent to the farmer and herdsman. Flexibility in the carrying-rates is needed, and there are many reasons why this should be so; for the farmer often has poor crops, frequently the market therefor is

too low, and the best interest of the transportation company lies in helping him over these lean places, as it gives him heart to enter the year that is to follow with courage to plant largely, in the hope that, when the harvest time comes again, he will have a larger output, with better prices, and thus be able to recover the loss of the previous season; while those who control the carrying companies and who, by their protective policy, have helped the farmer in the hour of his trouble and made him happy, would look back with satisfaction upon the wisdom of their own action, which has given them a continuing business, for nothing is much worse than having the cars and machinery of a railroad stand idle upon the tracks.

Again, a great drouth may occur in some sections of our vast country, and it becomes necessary under such circumstances to take out from such districts all the live-stock or to carry food in. Should this not be done, on humanitarian grounds alone, for lower rates than may be charged in sections not so afflicted, and that, too, without much regard to the distance? And when such consideration on the part of the railroad company is really advantageous to itself in the long run, can there be any doubt of its wisdom? What the carrying companies want is a continuing business and a fair profit for each decade, and in this reasonable expectation they should have the right to help their patrons during the "off" years, in the common interest.

Now, all this cannot be regulated by legislation, however carefully such legislation may be devised, simply because no provision of law can anticipate the varying requirements of trade. It can only be done by working upon flexible lines, so to speak, letting prices go up and down as will best serve the interest of both contracting parties. Why should it be otherwise? The judicial branch of the government has decided that it has the power, under the constitution, to say what is a fair income for railroad and other quasi-public institutions that do business for and with the public. Why should State legislatures endeavor to arbitrarily fix the rates, when no doubt the best interest of both shipper and carrier will be served by a graduation of those rates in accordance with the changing conditions of business? Of all property railroads should have the largest freedom, in order that they may be able to earn sufficient to pay a fair interest upon the capital invested, and to earn it in a way that shall most nearly conserve the interests of

their patrons and themselves. When a fair return upon invested capital has been received, the people, through the courts, can prevent rates from going up, and thus restrict the earnings of a railroad to reasonable figures.

Transportation companies can sometimes gather net money over train expenses in competition with water lines, and they should be allowed to do so, as their permanent way is expensive and fixed. It cannot be moved. The ship has its free right of way over all the seas, on which no taxes and no interest have to be paid; but the railroad is often doubly burdened by a tax not only upon its shares—which are only the evidence of ownership—but upon its real property, which is frequently assessed above its actual value.

In the high dry lands in the centre of the continent a few people have sometimes confederated together and carved counties out of the desert where there was no necessity for their creation, and built court-houses and school-houses where they were not needed, simply because the establishment of these institutions gave them the power to tax the property of the new county to pay for the so-called improvements; the principal, almost the only, property on which taxes could be levied being the railroad by which the so-called county is traversed. And after all this comes the politician with his demand for the appointment of men who, though possessing no interest whatever in the property, or knowledge or experience in its management, shall practically control its business by fixing the rates of fares and freights. Surely the time has come to call a halt, and, in the words of the great jurist, for the conservative branch of the government to step in "between individual rights and public greed."

C. P. HUNTINGTON.

COÖPERATIVE WOMANHOOD IN THE STATE.

BY MRS. MARY A. LIVERMORE.

SOME one has said that "civilization is organization." Certain it is that associated action for working purposes becomes possible only when society has attained a high state of development. It is the lowest matter in the scale that is unorganized, and of which we speak as inert, whether it be in the physical or social world. There is no surer indication of real advancement than the growing ability among men to subordinate complex and clashing interests, and to act jointly and harmoniously with each other for noble ends.

It was commonly believed in the near past that only half the human race possessed a fitness for organization; that only men knew how to specialize facts, combine for a definite purpose, and so translate isolated feebleness into associated strength without splitting into antagonisms that would defeat their aim. It was declared, *ex cathedrâ*, that women lacked this power; that they were emotional and sensitive, segregated by rivalries and unfaith in one another, unable to subject selfhood to efforts for the general well being; and that, therefore, solidarity of sentiment was not possible to them, nor unification of effort. There was an almost universal consensus of opinion among men on this point. And the facts superficially considered justified this belief. For there was a pitiful paucity of women's organizations in existence until little more than a quarter of a century ago. They were narrow in aim, limited in membership, rent with jealousies and petty scandals, and contemplated no larger results than the education of a theological student, the replenishing of a missionary's wardrobe, or the eking-out of the minister's salary.

The doors of a higher education were not widely open to women then, as now, and they sat in the retreating shadow of ignorance and injustice which has enshrouded them for ages. The predominance of physical force, as the governing power of the barbarous past, had compelled them to live in great isolation with regard to one another. They were weighted with needs and wrongs, and unacquainted with their rights and with the better

qualities of their common womanhood. It could not be expected that women would rise at once above the arbitrary standards of womanly inferiority steadily set before them. For the inheritance of traits of character is persistent, in proportion to the length of time they have been inherited. It is only through this general law of heredity that it is possible to account for the conservatism of many excellent women, who, from the beginning, have regarded with hostility the movements for the advancement of their sex.

Something more was necessary to arouse women, and to fuse and weld them into unified action, than the opening of doors of education and opportunity. There were needed the stimulus of a powerful appeal to their hearts, the menace of an impending danger to their homes and native land, a trumpet-call to duty that might not be disobeyed; and these came, simultaneously and with irresistible power, with the opening of the Civil War.

The great uprising among men, who ignored party and politics, and forgot sect and trade, in the fervor of their quickened love of country, was paralleled by a similar uprising among women. The incoming patriotism of the hour swept them to the loftiest height of devotion, and they were eager to do, to bear, or to suffer for the beloved country. "The earliest movement for army relief," says Dr. Bellows, "was begun by the women of the nation, and their zeal and devotion no more flagged through the war than did that of the army in the field." The barriers of sect, caste, and conventionalism, which had heretofore separated them, were burned away in the fervid heat of their loyalty. And patrician and plebeian, rich and poor, educated and ignorant, native and foreign-born, Protestant and Catholic, they all worked together, transformed by the spirit of the times into patriotic American citizens. They blundered in their first movements, as did the government in its early attempts to build up an effective army, and both learned by blundering.

President Lincoln, humane as were his instincts, greatly disapproved at first of this coöperative work of women for army relief, and withheld his indorsement of it for weeks, fearing lest it would prove "a dreadful fifth wheel to the coach," to quote his own language. And the highest officials of the government believed so little in the new organization, every day increasing in numbers, means, and effectiveness, that they only sought to render it harmless by "guiding it into a speedy nothingness." After

many hindrances, the Sanitary Commission received the indorsement of the administration, and slowly the obstacles in the path of the allied women vanished. They had, in reality, become a new volunteer arm of the service, only tolerated in the beginning, but at last trusted, respected, relied upon, and beloved. "I have never studied the art of paying compliments to women," said President Lincoln, some two and a half years later, in a public address at Philadelphia; "but I must say that if all that has been said by orators and poets since the creation of the world in praise of women was applied to the women of America, it would not do them justice for their conduct during this war."

At this time there were between ten and twelve thousand women's aid societies in existence, which, with an average membership of twenty,—and that is a small estimate,—included in the aggregate some two hundred thousand women. Banded together for a common cause, auxiliary to one Sanitary Commission, governed by the same laws, observing the same methods of work, sending all supplies gathered to one common depository, where they were at the service of any needy man who wore the army or navy blue, and all moneys made or collected to one common treasury, they slew sectionalism at the outset, and overcame the difficulties of coöperative undertakings at the very start.

It was understood that women were to raise the money and supplies for army relief, and that men were to disburse them; and this division of labor was observed throughout the war. But the women of the organization so largely outnumbered the men, whose multiform and arduous labors increased with the weary years, that large numbers of women became special disbursing and relief agents on the field, on hospital steamers and transports, in convalescent-camps, soldiers' homes, and elsewhere. There was great reluctance on the part of army surgeons to receive Protestant women nurses, even when their ability, training, and experience were vouched for by physicians at home. The Catholic sisters were preferred, and the first Protestant nurses sent to the hospitals of the Western army were rejected. But the powerful organization behind them appealed to Secretary Stanton, and the Protestant nurses carried the day. Hundreds of them were detailed to the service of nursing, and wrought side by side with the Catholic sisters in undisturbed friendliness, few of them asking or receiving compensation.

At the close of the war the Sanitary Commission, under whose auspices almost all the volunteer relief work of the army was done, made a general report of its labors to the people, whose agent it was and of whose beneficence it was the almoner. In its financial statement there is this estimate: "The aggregate of the receipts of the commission, of contributions in money to its branches and to their affiliated societies, of contributions of money's worth in goods, free transportation, etc., *cannot be less than twenty-five millions of dollars.*" It is no exaggeration to say that fully half of this vast amount found its way to the depository and treasury of the commission through the agency of its women's aid societies.

This was the first example of coöperative womanhood serving the state the world had ever witnessed, and as an education it was of incalculable value to women and to the nation. While they were working for the relief of the army, women studied the policy of the government, and learned what tremendous issues were at stake—the questions involved in the war and the immediate causes underlying it. They maintained a sturdy devotion to the national cause, lightened the gloom of every reverse, were undismayed by the discouragements of an embarrassed trade and commerce, which brought faintness to the hearts of men, and stoutly rebuked the manifestation of a disaffected, compromising, and unpatriotic spirit. All the while they maintained a prodigious correspondence with the soldiers in the army, "thus keeping the men in the field civilians," says Dr. Bellows, "and making the people at home, of both sexes, half-soldiers."

Not only did these women broaden in their views; they grew practical and executive in work. They learned how to coöperate intelligently with men; became expert in conducting public business, in calling and presiding over public meetings, even when men made a large part of the audience; learned how to draft constitutions and bylaws, to act as secretaries and committees; how to keep accounts with precision and system; how to answer, indorse, and file letters; how to sort their stores and keep an accurate account of stock; they attended meetings with regularity and promptness, and became punctilious in observance of official etiquette; in short, they developed rapidly a remarkable aptitude for business, on which men looked and wondered. "Where were these superior women before the war?" was frequently asked.

Above all, they learned one another, and found the world grown suddenly large for them, as they formed friendships with women from whom they had long held aloof because of local, sectarian, or personal jealousies and detractions. They had demonstrated the power of associated womanhood, when working harmoniously, and had awakened men to a consciousness that there were in women possibilities and potencies of which they had never dreamed. The lesson has not been forgotten. The young women of that day are the middle-aged women of the present time, better educated than their mothers, more self-poised, and instinct with vital interest in all that concerns the human race. The girls born during that period are our young women, who are coming on the stage better equipped for the work of life and with larger opportunities awaiting them than ever before dawned on a woman's vision. Colleges have been founded for them, scientific, professional ; art and industrial schools have opened their doors to them ; remunerative employments have given them entrance, sometimes in advance of their capacity and fitness ; while freedom of choice and action is the birthright of American women as of no others on the globe. Under these stimulating circumstances, what have women accomplished during the last quarter of a century ?

A magazine article would be altogether inadequate for even a condensed answer to this question,—and this paper treats only of women's coöperative work. The leading women of the various Protestant denominations were the first to utilize the coöperative spirit developed by the women of the war. They were painfully impressed with the fact that the foreign missionary associations, to which they were contributing, were not benefiting the women of heathen lands as they were the men, and for two reasons : the funds at their command were insufficient, and, in addition, the women of heathendom were inaccessible to men missionaries, because oriental custom compels their segregation from all male society, save that of their own households. Nor were the wives of the missionaries equal to the task of reaching the heathen women, for they were heavily burdened with their own family cares.

The war had just closed, the soldiers'-aid societies were disbanding, and it was not difficult to win some of the trained workers into a new field of action, especially as the object proposed was "the elevation of women." "Women's missionary boards"

were speedily formed in several denominations, which made "work for heathen women a specialty," and sent out "unmarried women missionaries to labor for their own sex." They established schools for the native women, and trained them in domestic, industrial, and religious matters. Women physicians, thoroughly educated and duly qualified, were added to the staff of missionary workers, who founded hospitals for women and children, established dispensaries, and trained native women in nursing. The first of these societies was organized less than twenty-five years ago, and the majority of them much later. But they are to-day so numerous that they report "a contributing membership of about one and a half million women, who raise and disburse about two millions of dollars every year." Their schools for women and girls, conducted by trained women teachers, are established by hundreds in all pagan and semi-civilized countries. Only educated single women are employed in the foreign work by these women's boards, and if they possess some grace or charm of manner it renders them more valuable for their self-imposed service. For the daily well-ordered life of a refined, devout, and cultivated young woman must be a perpetual education to the ignorant and down-trodden daughters of heathendom.

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union next came to the front—"an association that has become equally distinguished for the friends it has won and the enemies it has made." Its beginnings were small and humble, and its present magnitude and field of operations were not foreseen or provided for. It was the outcome of a protest made by Western women, a decade after the war, against the gross drunkenness of their neighborhoods, which was engulfing them, blighting their homes, defrauding their children, and consigning men, dear to them as their hearts' blood, to beggary, crime, disease, and ruin. The movement was phenomenal and exceptional, and ran like prairie-fire. It could not be copied, cannot be repeated, had its day, and soon spent itself; but it accomplished its work. Like a bugle-blast, it startled the women of the nation, compelled the attention of the country, and has eventuated in an organization which is compact, far-reaching, and dead in earnest. It is organized in every State and territory of the Union, each having its own headquarters, its auxiliary and tributary societies, the whole

controlled by a national union, whose headquarters are in Chicago, and which meets annually.

Its membership of adult women exceeds two hundred thousand, and is gaining at the rate of ten thousand a year, as was shown by last year's census. Any woman can join the union by signing a pledge of total abstinence from intoxicating beverages and paying her membership fee. For its only creed is "total abstinence for the individual and prohibition for the State." Affiliated with this organization, and under the same management, are large numbers of young women's unions,—"honoraries" that yield money, but have no voice in the direction of affairs, and "loyal legions" composed of children and youth verging on manhood and womanhood,—which swell the working contingent of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union to something like three hundred and fifty thousand members.

The plant of its Women's Temperance Publishing Association was valued last January at $56,934. It publishes three weekly papers, the largest of which attained last year an average weekly circulation of 90,327. During the same time it sent out 125,000,000 pages of literature, among which were books by well-known authors, and handled over $200,000. Its admirable business manager is a woman of large experience and thorough training for her work; its stock sells readily and yields 6 per cent. interest; it can never be sold for less than par value, and then only to women members of the union. Its Woman's Building Association is erecting an immense building on La Salle Street, Chicago, in which the National Union will have headquarters and carry on its manifold and increasing work, and which will ultimately yield a superb income to its treasury. It is to be thirteen stories high, and will cost $1,200,000. It will be ready for occupancy in May, 1892. When completed, the property will be worth two and a half million dollars. Its income from rentals will amount to a quarter of a million. A large number of the offices are already rented.

The objective aim of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is, ultimately, the State. Its managers understand that whoever would change the laws of the republic can only do it by first changing the convictions of the people. They have thoroughly studied the whole question, and are confident that the abolition of the drinking-customs of the country will cause a corresponding reduction in the numbers of criminals, lunatics, paupers,

defective, dependent, and dangerous classes now afflicting the community. This belief furnishes the stimulus for their tremendous work and sacrifice, and the cohesive force of their organization. All their various religious beliefs and political preferences are subordinated to their one aim, and they all pull together with surprising unanimity, gaining something in one direction or another year by year. In eight years they have procured in thirty-five States, ten territories, and the District of Columbia the enactment of laws which compel the education of twelve million public-school children in the nature and physiological effects of alcoholic drinks and narcotics. If in some instances the laws lack force from defective legislation, the women who have made this their life-work remedy difficulties and enlarge and perfect their operations as they proceed. Over thirty other departments of work are organized inside the union, all of which converge towards the one great aim of the association—the cultivation of an enlightened sentiment, that will ultimately abolish drunkenness and extinguish the traffic in alcoholic drinks.

The Illinois Women's Alliance, with headquarters in Chicago, is composed of women sent as delegates from other organizations in the city, and is cosmopolitan in character. Men's organizations join by sending women as delegates. A Masonic chapter, O. E. S., a Christian-science association, aid societies, suffrage, medical, temperance, ethical, and hospital associations, with labor unions, are represented. The delegates of the Trade and Labor Assembly of Chicago represent a force of 25,000 men and women. Women of all classes of society, and from all sects, ignore their differences and unite in work to realize the aims of the alliance, which are as follows: (1) "to obtain enforcement of all laws enacted for the protection of women and children, and to secure the enactment of such laws as may be necessary"; (2) "to investigate all business establishments and factories where women and children are employed, and public institutions where women and children are maintained"; (3) "to procure the appointment of women as health inspectors, as members of boards of education, and to serve on boards of management of public institutions."

In an annual report of the alliance, made last February, there is the following statement of the work it has accomplished:

"It created great excitement by its labors with the City Council, petitioning that body to instruct the Board of Education to enforce the Compul-

sory-Education Law, which had been a dead-letter for several years, and at last gained its point. The enforcement of the law requires the work of twenty-five truant officers, thirteen of whom are women."

"It called public attention to the fact that one-quarter of the teachers' salaries, each year, was withheld for four months. In the course of the discussion it was brought out that the salaries of policemen and firemen were similarly curtailed each year. Somebody was using the money withheld, or drawing interest on it. The alliance continued the agitation until teachers, police, and firemen promptly received their money."

"It procured the enactment of an ordinance which has caused the appointment of five sanitary policewomen—the first in the world—to inspect the establishments where women and children are employed. They wear a star, and are admitted everywhere. It also caused the enactment of an ordinance forbidding the labor of children over eight hours a day, and the sale of cigarettes to minors under sixteen."

"It attended the meeting of the City Council, in a body five hundred women strong, to emphasize its demand for a second woman on the School Board. She was appointed in spite of the unwillingness of the mayor. It has visited and criticised twenty-six public institutions, for their permanent good."

It has standing committees who are working to procure free bathing establishments and a State school for dependent children, to effect organizations of women according to the political divisions of the city, to attend the County Court on days when homeless children are assigned to institutions, to attend the meetings of the Board of Education, and to visit in turn the public schools. The motto of the alliance is: "Loyalty to Women—Justice to Children!"

It was through the insistent, coöperative work of the women of Massachusetts, which stretched through nearly a dozen years, that the Women's Reformatory Prison was built at Sherborn, in the eastern part of the State, some fourteen or more years ago. It is a model institution of its kind, unsurpassed in the world, and is so wonderfully managed by the women officials who have it in charge that reformation of the majority of its women convicts is almost certain. Some six or seven years ago the women of the State united in another work for women criminals. A House of Detention for all women arrested, and police matrons to take charge of them, had become a necessity. Decency, respect for womanhood, and the proper care of women prisoners demanded it. The Women's Christian Temperance Unions, the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, the Women's Moral Education Association, the New England Women's Press Association, the Woman's Club, and four other large bodies of women joined in

petitions and work for the new prison accommodations. For five long years they waged an unceasing warfare with sluggishness, ignorance, and brutality, which had intrenched themselves on official boards and in police stations, and finally triumphed. The new House of Detention in Boston was opened in March, and receives four hundred women prisoners monthly, who are in charge of police matrons, and the first step in their recovery from evil is taken. More recently, another movement was made for the appointment of women factory inspectors, for the better oversight and protection of the women and girls employed in the various manufactories abounding in Massachusetts, and that reform was also accomplished.

The women of Massachusetts obtained the right to vote for school committees in 1879. It was so small an opportunity, and so hampered by restrictions and impossible conditions, as greatly to reduce its value in the minds of women. In the small towns of the State the methods of transacting the municipal business were such as to destroy the right altogether, for there was no opportunity given women to vote for school committees. In 1888 there came an occasion when women were able to accomplish something by using the fractional right doled out to them. The Boston School Committee, under the influence of Catholic politicians, had displaced some of the text-books in use, and introduced in their stead others, "expurgated and indorsed by a Baltimore Catholic Plenary Council." They had taken other steps, which were construed as Catholic aggressions on the public schools, and were condemned as unconstitutional and sectarian; and immediately, in advance of the action of men, organizations of women were formed to oppose them. Before the day of election, although the time was short, over 26,000 women had qualified to vote, and of these 19,000 went to the polls, and cast their ballots, in such inclemency of weather as kept hosts of men off the streets. They revolutionized the School Committee, and aroused, for the time, a public spirit that forbade the manipulation of the common schools in the interest of any sect.

In November, 1884, the Ladies' Health-Protective Association was organized in the city of New York, eleven women uniting with it. They began work by attacking the manure-yard of one Michael Kane, at the foot of East Forty-Sixth Street—the filthiest thing in the city. For years he had defiantly maintained

his monstrous nuisance, despite incessant complaints and a grand-jury indictment. In less than three months his manure-heap had disappeared. In 1886 he tried again, and by the aid of the Legislature sought to establish a permanent dumping-ground between Ninety-fifth and Ninety-seventh Streets. The women promptly rallied, fought him before the grand jury, and through two sessions of the Legislature, and utterly vanquished him. They then addressed themselves to some of the most difficult problems of city government, and accomplished the abatement of slaughter-house nuisances within the city limits and the repair or reconstruction of leaky gas-houses, compelled improvements in the conditions under which cows were kept and fed within the city, exposed the pollutions which were damaging the city's water-supply and brought about their removal, remedied the unsanitary conditions of many of the public schools, the methods of caring for women prisoners, and achieved the suppression of many minor nuisances.

The association wiped out "Little Italy," a district where a colony of Italians had crowded into hovels without the least regard to cleanliness and decency, and where the dirt, squalor, and moral corruption were indescribable. They are still at work, trying to secure public crematories for the disposition of garbage, to accomplish street-cleaning and other much-needed reforms. In the five years of their existence their numbers have increased from eleven to 700, all of whom coöperate in this hard work. They have been obliged to study the laws bearing on the evils they have sought to cure, to secure the opinion of experts, to give personal investigation to nuisances demanding abatement, to become acquainted with legal technicalities, to obtain the repeal, amendment, and enactment of statutes and ordinances. They have come in contact with the dark side of New York, and have visited localities in the prosecution of their work where the escort of several policemen was necessary to protect them from its low and rough classes. They have appeared before the Board of Health, courts, grand juries, and legislative committees—in short, "have done everything in the way of active participation in legitimate municipal politics, except to vote and hold office."

There are upwards of sixty coöperative societies of women, of national scope, engaged in the philanthropies of the country, like

the Women's Relief Corps, the King's Daughters, protective agencies for women and children, the working-girls' guilds, the women's educational and industrial unions, etc., and their aggregate membership runs up to half a million. They own and erect buildings for their work, disburse funds, look after defective, dependent, and delinquent classes of women and children, establish industrial schools, kindergartens, and day-nurseries, and do whatever other work comes to them for the helping of the age. One of them, the Ramabai Association, stands behind the school for high-caste Hindoo widows, in Poona, India, established and taught by the Pundita Ramabai, who three years ago canvassed America for funds to maintain her school until it should be self-supporting. She has erected a bungalow for her work with money contributed by American women.

The woman-suffrage societies are composed of men and women, in most localities, but the work is almost entirely done by women. The magnitude of the change contemplated by this reform has necessarily delayed it. "It involves a radical reconstruction of social ideas and usages all along the line of human relations," and will not be accomplished until the government, now composed of men alone, shall be changed into a government of men and women. "Twenty-three States have conceded the principle of woman suffrage by making women voters in school elections. Three States have given women the right to vote on liquor licenses. Kansas has given women suffrage in municipal elections. And Wyoming, after twenty-one years' experience as a woman-suffrage territory, has given women full suffrage and political equality through its State constitution." Under cover of the fire which has been kept up for nearly fifty years for women's enfranchisement, the whole social system has been changed. The legal status of wives, mothers, and widows has been greatly modified; education, self-support, and opportunity have been accorded to women; a larger conception of womanhood prevails, and the days of "women's subjection" are nearly ended. The agitation of the woman-suffrage question for half a century has made possible the large work of women to-day, in education, philanthropy, reform, and coöperative work.

Some six years since a Woman's National Council was organized in America, which meets once in three years in Washington, D. C. It is composed of delegates sent from national organiza-

tions of women only, and at the last meeting of the council, in February, between fifty and sixty of these were represented. Reports were made of the work and gain of women during the past three years, plans were outlined for the future, and the needs, aims, and ideals of women came under general discussion. The audiences were very large, composed mostly of women, serious, attentive, punctual, and enthusiastic. So manifest is the tendency of women at the present time to draw more closely together, to keep touch with each other in thought and purpose, to unite in an organization "superior to any existing society," that the retiring president presented a plan of federation that would accomplish this.

If accepted, there would be organized "within the national government, as carried on by men, a republic of women, duly organized and officered, in no wise antagonistic to men, but conducted as much in their interest as in that of women. It would promote mutual fellowship among women, and establish solidarity of sentiment and purpose throughout the nation of women workers. It would put a premium on organized as against isolated efforts for human betterment. It would train women for the next great step in the evolution of humanity, when women shall sit side by side in government, and the nations shall learn war no more."

Whatever may be the fate of this plan for a national federation of women, one thing is certain. Women have learned the omnipotence and happiness of coöperative work, and the weakness and weariness of that which is isolated. And this is sure to make them more fruitful of accomplishment hereafter, whether their plans of work shall include themselves, their homes and their children, society or the nation.

> "For the cause that lacks assistance,
> 'Gainst the wrong that needs resistance,
> For the future in the distance,
> There's a woman's right to do!"

MARY A. LIVERMORE.

A FAMOUS NAVAL EXPLOIT.*

BY THE LATE ADMIRAL PORTER.

OFFICE OF THE ADMIRAL,
WASHINGTON, D. C.,
November 21, 1888.

MY DEAR GENERAL:

I received your letter of the 20th instant, informing me that you are about to deliver an address on the "The Young Heroes, Cushing and Custer," and requesting that I would write and give my opinion of Commander Cushing.

I like to talk and write about Cushing. He was one of those brave spirits developed by the Civil War who always rose to the occasion. He was always ready to undertake any duty, no matter how desperate, and he generally succeeded in his enterprises, from the fact that the enemy supposed that no man would be foolhardy enough to embark in such hazardous affairs where there seemed so little chance of success. A very interesting volume could be written on the adventures of Cushing from the time he entered the navy until his death, during which period he performed some remarkable deeds and left a reputation unparalleled for so young an officer.

One of the most gallant and successful affairs accomplished during the Civil War was the destruction of a Confederate ironclad ram by Lieutenant Cushing at Plymouth, N. C., on the night of October 27, 1864. It may be remembered that the ram "Albemarle" had suddenly appeared at Plymouth, causing the destruction of the U. S. S. "Southfield," the death of the brave Lieutenant Flusser, and the retreat of the double-ender "Miami," and had subsequently attacked a flotilla under Captain Melancton Smith, inflicting much damage, but was obliged finally to retire before the Union vessels under the guns of Plymouth, which had

* This extremely interesting letter was addressed to General James Grant Wilson by the late Admiral Porter, and has not heretofore been published.—EDITOR NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

fallen into the hands of the Confederates owing to the advent of the "Albemarle."

As soon as Lieutenant Cushing heard of this affair he offered his services to the Navy Department to blow up the "Albemarle," provided the department would furnish proper torpedo-boats with which to operate. His services were accepted, and he was ordered to the New York Navy-Yard to superintend the fitting out of three torpedo-launches on a plan deemed at that time a very perfect one.

Cushing, though a dashing "free-lance," was not so well adapted to the command of a "flotilla" (as he called his three steam-launches). When completed, he started with his boats from New York, via the Delaware and Raritan Canal, as proud as a peacock. One of them sank in the canal soon after he started ; another was run on shore by the officer in charge, on the coast of Virginia, in Chesapeake Bay, where she was surrendered to the Confederates ; while Cushing, with that singular good luck which never deserted him, steamed down the bay through the most stormy weather, and arrived safely at Hampton Roads, where he reported to me on board the flagship "Malvern."

This was my first acquaintance with Cushing, and, after inquiring into all the circumstances of the loss of the other two torpedo-boats, I did not form the most favorable opinion of Cushing's abilities as a flotilla-commander. Cushing's condition when he reported on board the flagship was most deplorable. He had been subjected to the severest exposure for over a week, without shelter. had lost all his clothes except what little he had on, and his attenuated face and sunken eyes bore witness to the privations he had suffered. Officers and crew had subsisted on spoiled ship's biscuit and water and an occasional potato roasted before the boiler fire.

I at once ordered Cushing and his men to stow themselves away for rest, and directed them not to appear till sent for. In the mean time the launch, which had been very much disarranged and shattered, was being put in complete order. After the officers and crew had obtained forty-eight hours' rest, I sent for Cushing and gave him his instructions, which were to proceed through the Dismal Swamp Canal and the sounds of North Carolina, and blow up the "Albemarle," then lying at Plymouth preparing for another raid on the Union fleet. Commander W. H. Macomb, command-

ing in the sound, was ordered to give Cushing all the assistance in his power, with men and boats.

When rested and dressed, Cushing was a different-looking man from the pitiable object who had presented himself to me two days before. Scanning him closely, I asked him many questions, all of which were answered satisfactorily, and, after looking steadily into his cold, gray eye and finding that he did not wink an eyelid, I said: "You will do. I am satisfied that you will perform this job. If you do, you will be made a lieutenant-commander."

On the very morning appointed for Cushing to sail on his perilous expedition an order came from the Navy Department to try him by court-martial for some infraction of international law towards an English vessel, which, according to Mr. Seward, had endangered the *entente cordiale* between England and the United States. I showed Cushing the order, but he was not disconcerted. "Admiral," he said, "let me go and blow up the 'Albemarle,' and try me afterwards."

"Well done for you," I said; "I will do it. Now get off at once, and do not fail, or you will rue it."

So Cushing, who dreaded a court-martial more than he did the ram, went on his way rejoicing, passed through the canal, and on the 27th of October reported to Commander Macomb.

Cushing was near coming to grief on his first setting-out. Like all "free-lances," he liked a frolic, and could not resist champagne and terrapin; so on the evening of his arrival at Norfolk he gave a supper to his numerous friends, "and then—the deluge!" I heard of the supper, of course,—it was my business to hear of such things,—and I despatched Fleet-Captain Breese in a swift steam-launch to arrest the delinquent and have him tried for intruding on the *entente cordiale* between the United States and Great Britain; but Captain Breese returned with the report that Cushing was on his way and that "it was all right." "No," I said, "it is not 'all right'; and if the expedition fails, you—" but never mind what I said.

By eight o'clock on the 27th of October Cushing had picked out his volunteers from Macomb's flotilla. They consisted of thirteen officers and men, one of whom was the faithful William L. Howarth, who had accompanied him in most of his daring adventures, and these two together felt that they were a match for

any iron-clad in the Confederacy. That night Cushing started off on the expedition, towing the "Otsego's" cutter with an armed crew, who were to be employed in seizing the Confederate look-outs on board of the late U. S. S. "Southfield," which lay below Plymouth with her decks just above water.

The ram lay about eight miles from the mouth of the river, which was two or three hundred yards in width and supposed to be lined with Confederate pickets. The wreck of the "Southfield" was surrounded by schooners, and it was understood that a gun had been mounted here to command the bend of the river. When the steam-launch and her tow reached the "Southfield," the hearts of the adventurers began to beat with anxiety. Every moment they expected a load of grape and canister, which would have been the signal for *qui vive* all along the river bank.

The expedition was looked upon as a kind of forlorn hope by all who saw it start, and Cushing himself was not certain of success until after he passed the "Southfield" and the schooners. His keen gray eye looked into the darkness ahead, intent only on the "Albemarle." The boat astern of the launch cast off at the right time and secured the pickets on board the schooners without firing a shot, and Cushing and his party passed unobserved by the pickets on the river banks, who depended on the lookouts on board the "Southfield" and were making themselves comfortable under cover. This was a fortunate circumstance for Cushing, for otherwise the expedition might have failed. As it was, the torpedo-launch was enabled to approach unobserved to within a few yards of the "Albemarle."

The ram had been well prepared for defence, and a good look-out was kept up on board. She was secured to a wharf with heavy logs all around her—in fact, she was in a pen. Half of her crew were on deck with two field-pieces and a company of artillery, and another company of artillery was stationed on the wharf with several field-pieces, while a bright fire of pine logs burned in front of them.

Cushing immediately comprehended the situation, and while he was making his plans the lookout on board the "Albemarle" discovered the launch and hailed, when there succeeded great excitement and confusion amongst the enemy. Cushing dashed at the logs on which the light was reflected, and by putting on all steam he pushed them aside and struck the "Albemarle" bows

on. In the mean time the enemy had become thoroughly aroused and the men on board the ram rushed to quarters and opened on the torpedo-boat, but the Confederates were swept away by the discharge of a twelve-pound howitzer in the bow of the launch. A gun loaded with grape and canister was fired by the enemy, but the fire of the boat howitzer disconcerted the aim of the Confederate gunner, and the charge passed harmlessly over.

While all this firing was going on, the torpedo boom was deliberately lowered until it was under the "Albemarle's" bottom, or overhang, and by a quick pull of the firing-rope the torpedo was exploded. There was a tremendous crash and a great upward rush of water which instantly filled the topedo-boat, and she went drifting off with the current, but she left the "Albemarle" rapidly sinking. The Confederate commander, Lieutenant A. W. Warley, encouraged his crew and endeavored to keep his vessel afloat as soon as he discovered the damage done, but the water gained so rapidly through the aperture made by the explosion that the "Albemarle" was soon on the bottom, her smoke-stack only remaining above water. As the Confederates had no appliances for raising the iron-clad, they did all they could to damage her further, knowing that the Federal flotilla would not be long in appearing to claim the prize.

The "Albemarle" had been fully prepared for this attack, and had her crew at their posts; which makes the successful raid the more to be appreciated. A good watch was kept on board the ram, as was shown by the alertness with which the crew got to quarters and fired their guns; but they escaped to the shore with equal alertness, for the "Albemarle" sank with great rapidity. It was fortunate for Cushing that he succeeded in passing the pickets along the river undisturbed, for otherwise he would have had a warm reception all along the line; but he seemed to be the child of fortune, and his good luck followed him to the close of the war.

When the fire was opened on the torpedo-boat, Assistant-Paymaster Frank H. Swan was wounded at Cushing's side. How many others had been injured was not known. It seemed as if a shower of grape-shot had hit the boat, and that a rifle shell had passed through her fore and aft; but this was not so. The boat had sunk from the rush of water caused by the torpedo; and when Cushing saw that she would probably fall into the hands of the

enemy, he jumped overboard with some of the crew, and swam down the river under a heavy fire of musketry, which, however, did no harm.

When some of the crew of the torpedo-boat who had jumped overboard saw that she had only filled with water and did not sink, they swam back to her and climbed on board, hoping that the boat would float away with the current from the scene of danger ; but in this they were mistaken ; for as soon as the Confederates recovered from their panic and saw the torpedo-boat drifting away, they manned the boats of the "Albemarle," which were still intact, and followed the author of the mischief. Surrounding the steam-launch, with oaths and imprecations they demanded the surrender of the Union party. Nothing else was left for the latter to do. Their arms were all wet in the bottom of the boat and the enemy was lining the banks with sharpshooters, so that "discretion was the better part of valor."

"Blast you," said one of the Confederates, "if you sunk us with your cowardly torpedo-boat, we licked your whole squadron last week, and we will make you fellows smell thunder with a ball and chain to your leg."

This was the first the torpedo-boat's crew had heard of the sinking of the "Albemarle." In fact, they were under the impression that the attack was a failure, and that the boat had been filled by a rifle shell striking her, and not by the water thrown up by the explosion. They all gave three cheers, though they knew that the Confederates were exasperated and their carbines were pointed at the captives' heads.

In the mean time Cushing was quietly swimming down the river, keeping in the middle of the stream, when, hearing a noise near him, he looked around and found that two other persons were in company with him. One of them whispered : "I am getting exhausted ; for God's sake help me to the shore."

"Who are you ?" said Cushing.

"I am Woodman. I can go no farther : save me if you can."

At the same moment a gurgling sound was heard a little to the rear, and the third man sank to rise no more.

Cushing himself was much exhausted. He had managed to rid himself of his heaviest clothing and his boots, and was just letting himself drift with the current, but he could not resist this

appeal from Woodman, who had risked his life to assist him in his perilous undertaking. He put an arm around him and tried to reach the bank, only sixty yards away, but all his efforts were futile. Woodman was too much exhausted. He could not help himself, and, cramps coming on, he was drawn all up, got away from Cushing, and sank.

Thus the only two survivors known to Cushing from the steam-launch had sunk before his eyes, and he did not know how soon his own time would come, for he was now so much exhausted that he could scarcely use his arms for swimming. At the same time he heard the shouts of the Confederates as they captured the launch, and, supposing that the enemy would send their boats down the river in search of fugitives, he determined to swim to the shore. He could barely crawl out of the water when he reached the bank at a point about a mile below Plymouth.

Cushing dragged himself into an adjacent swamp, and, while lying concealed a few feet from a path along the river, heard two of the "Albemarle's" officers and a picket guard pass by, and learned from their conversation that the iron-clad was at the bottom of the river. He did not care now what became of him; that was glory enough for one day, and he would take no heed for the morrow.

As soon as his strength would allow, Cushing plunged into the dense swamp, where he was not likely to be followed, and, after incredible difficulties in forcing his way through the mud, slime, and brambles, reached a point well below the town, where he felt safe. Here he fell in with a negro who, for a consideration (being a Union man), volunteered to go to Plymouth to find out exactly how matters stood. The negro soon returned with the cheering news that the "Albemarle" was actually sunk, and that the Confederates were in great consternation. Thus cheered, Cushing pursued his tedious journey through the swamps till, coming suddenly to a creek, he found one of the enemy's picket-boats, of which he took possession. He pulled away with all his remaining strength, not knowing at what moment he might get a bullet through his head from the guard to whom the boat belonged, who was no doubt not far off in some shanty playing cards with a fellow-picket.

By eleven o'clock the following night Cushing reached the gunboat "Valley City," out in the sound, and was taken on

board more dead than alive, after one of the most remarkable and perilous adventures on record. Certain it was that Cushing had made himself famous by performing an achievement the dangers of which were almost insurmountable, for the enemy had taken every precaution against just such an attempt as had been made.

The success of Cushing shows that a man who makes up his mind to a certain thing and goes directly to the point, undeterred by obstacles, is almost sure to win, not only in blowing up ships, but in every-day affairs of life where great stakes are at risk. Here was a chance, and Cushing "seized the bull by the horns," *voild tout.* No doubt he would have made the attempt if he had been obliged to run the gantlet of all the pickets from the mouth of the river to Plymouth.

This gallant affair led to the recapture of Plymouth from the Confederates, for Commander Macomb had been ordered by me to attack the town (in case the "Albemarle" was destroyed) with the Federal gunboats, which he did most successfully, and Plymouth remained in possession of the Federal forces to the end of the war. Cushing was promoted a little later, and received some sixty or seventy thousand dollars in prize money; and suffice it to say that I never tried Cushing by court-martial on Secretary Seward's charges of endangering the *entente cordiale* between England and the United States.

In many respects Cushing and Custer were alike: what one was to the navy the other was to the army,—dashing, reckless, brave men, strangers to fear, who never thought of the consequences to themselves in any undertaking, no matter how desperate. The two men were not only similar in character, but person; their features were bold, the expression of the eyes was the same, and both had lithe figures which seemed proof against fatigue. Put them side by side, and they would have passed for brothers. Perhaps nature fashions that kind of men alike mentally and physically. Certain it is that Cushing and Custer were two of the most fearless spirits who made their marks in the two branches of the service during the Civil War.

I remain, very respectfully yours,

DAVID D. PORTER, Admiral U. S. Navy.

General JAMES GRANT WILSON.

ANECDOTES OF ENGLISH CLERGYMEN.

BY THE HON. C. K. TUCKERMAN.

THE "Established Church" in England is a marvellous institution; not so much for what it does in the saving of souls as from the fact that it is *established*. Anything established and maintained by government is a potent magnet which attracts and holds fast the iron will of conservative Englishmen. The why or wherefore is a question never raised; the fact is accepted by the adherents of the church though it should override religion itself. I heard an old conservative, who had been impatiently listening to the argument of a dissenter against church doctrine, put an end to the discussion by bringing his fist down upon the table with a tremendous bang, as he exclaimed: "Sir, it matters not whether the doctrines of the Church of England are sound or unsound: they are *established*, and that is enough for me."

I have met casually several distinguished clergymen of both the established and dissenting churches, and have found them, socially, to be among the most delightful of conversationalists. Especially has this been the case when my clerical companion has been alone with me in a railway carriage, on shipboard, or at a foreign hotel, where, freed, for the time being, from the restraints of professional conventionality, he has betrayed the mundane side of his character, expanded into mirth, and proved that, as Sam Slick puts it, there was "a good deal of human nater in the man, arter all."

My first specimen of an English clergyman left upon my mind such an agreeable impression of geniality and unaffected kindness, although I was an entire stranger to him, that it very likely gave a color to my subsequent opinion of the whole class. This was many years ago, when, as a young and inexperienced traveller, I was visiting London for the first time. He was a tall, distinguished-looking man, with marked features and a most benevolent expression of countenance, and wore a stiff clerical hat, leggings, and shoe-buckles. He was standing beside me in front of the cage of monkeys at the Zoölogical Gardens, when a most amusing scene

occurred. What we saw was this: In the midst of the antics going on in the cage, or, rather, large compartment, filled with monkeys of all sorts and sizes, one little fellow sat on his tree at the extremity of the cage casting his eyes about, apparently intent on mischief. Suddenly he sprung to the ground, and, stealthily creeping along the back of the cage, so as to escape observation, approached, from behind, a big old-fashioned-looking ape, who, like a grave judge absorbed in meditation, sat immovable, and apparently unconscious of what was going on about him, on a high post at that end of the cage. Watching his opportunity, the little monkey glided up the post and pulled the big one's tail. In a second he was back again at the spot he had left, securing his retreat by following the same course as before, and, gliding up the tree, sat there looking into vacancy, the picture of conscious innocence. Old Judge, who had no idea of allowing the act of indignity put upon him to pass unpunished, took his time about it. Moving his great clumsy body slowly round so as to survey the entire cage, he carefully examined the face of each monkey in turn to ascertain, by its expression, which among them was the culprit. This investigation lasted several minutes, when finally, by some intuitive process of mind, he seemed to have decided that the little innocent-looking fellow on the far-off tree was the one who was "wanted." Thereupon, with a succession of tremendous leaps over monkeys and under monkeys, the big beast reached the tree where sat the offender, mounted it, and, before the latter had a chance to escape, seized him by the nape of the neck and cuffed his ears. Having thus passed sentence and executed it at the same time, Old Judge descended the tree, and, walking solemnly back to his post, resumed his attitude of dignified repose.

"Wonderful! Wonderful!" said the clergyman at my side, turning towards me; "almost human; is it not?" Then, encouraged by my interest in the proceedings, he enlarged upon the traits and characteristics of the monkey, giving many details which were new to me. As he conversed we passed on together to the adjoining room, where some specimens of snakes attracted his attention, upon which he again discoursed, giving me a good deal of information in a familiar, unobtrusive way that surprised and charmed me. Still conversing, we passed out of the building and down the broad garden walk, at the end of

which I parted from my affable companion, with thanks for his entertaining conversation.

"Who is that clergyman?" I asked of a man in livery, a guide or superintendent of the garden, who, at a little distance off, had been profusely bowing to the reverend gentleman as he passed on his way. The man looked at me as if I were hoaxing him.

"You do not know, sir? Why, I thought I seed you a-walkin' and a-talkin' with His Grace."

"His Grace? Then he is a bishop, I suppose. I ought to have known as much from the cord on his hat."

"That gentleman, sir, with whom you've ben a-walkin' and a-talkin', is His Grace"—here the man stepped back the better to observe the effect upon me of the information he was about to impart—"the Harchbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all Hingland!" (Dr. Sumner.)

One Sunday I attended the services, at St. George's Hall, of the Rev. Charles Voysey, whose influence, although limited to a small congregation, is an influence for good. Formerly a preacher of the Church of England, Voysey was inhibited, chiefly through the instrumentality of the Archbishop of York, and after trial by the bench of bishops was declared to be guilty of "erroneous doctrine." The case created some excitement at the time, and the subscription by the friends of Voysey to the "defence fund" showed an undertone of theological sympathy for him which had not been supposed to exist. On the Sunday when I was present the discourse dwelt upon the alarming increase of dishonest practices in commercial transactions, and, among other instances, the preacher alluded to the adulteration of American products and the weighting of cotton bales with scrap-iron previous to their shipment to Liverpool. Some instances of this fraud had lately come to light, but I believed these to be exceptional, and that the sweeping assertion of general dishonesty reflected most unfairly upon a large and respectable body of my countrymen. This I stated in a letter I addressed to him on the following day, and, as each sermon was subsequently printed for general distribution, I begged that the statement from the pulpit might be corrected before printing. Mr. Voysey promptly replied, expressing his regret for the charge he had made under a misapprehension of the facts, and promised to make the necessary corrections. When this was done, I thought it proper to thank Mr. Voysey in per-

son, and found him to be a most agreeable and intelligent gentleman.

The Rev. Stopford Brooke is another independent clergyman, but of a different stamp. When I first met him at the house of his friend and parishioner, Mr. Russell Sturgis, he was one of the "Queen's chaplains" and was filling St. James's Chapel with the admirers of his pure and graceful oratory. In the course of conversation I expressed my regret that I could not obtain a pew for my family in the body of his church. He said, with a smile, that before long there would be no difficulty in obtaining one, for, not being liberal enough for one prime minister and too liberal for another prime minister (naming them), he expected, between the two stools, to come to the ground. And soon afterwards this occurred, or, rather, he descended gracefully, of his own accord, from a position which had become gradually irksome to him by the growth of his independent thought. Then he established a church of his own, where he could enunciate his theological views without conscientious scruples. He told me one day, as he sat smoking a brier pipe in his library, that he had gained, in point of numbers, as many members for his new church as he had lost from the old one. Since then, I believe, the increase of membership has been large.

I will now introduce an English clergyman of an equally distinct class, the Rev. Charles Spurgeon, whose acquaintance I made in the smoking-room of a hotel on the Italian Riviera, where we met regularly after dinner for a succession of weeks. Sometimes we were alone together; at other times the company of smokers was enlarged; but in either case Spurgeon confined himself to his one cigar per day, and, when it was consumed, retired to his own rooms for study or for work, never reappearing except at the *table-d'hôte* meals. When alone with me his conversation was chiefly confined to the religious work he is engaged in; his London "Tabernacle," with its five or six thousand worshippers; his college for clergymen or his orphanage, both of which he founded; his books and other writings; or the details of his clerical life.

When Spurgeon and I were joined by other gentlemen in the smoking-room, he dropped his personal affairs and joined in whatever subject came up. But I never knew an evening to pass without at least one good anecdote from his immense répertoire.

I heard him preach but once, and that was in London, but not in his own Tabernacle. There was nothing especially quaint in his delivery, but he was, of course, original.

Toward the close of his sermon he said he had a letter to read to the congregation, and produced it from his pocket. It was from an English lad who had found employment on a farm in one of the Western States of America, but of whom he had never heard before the receipt of the letter. In it the lad said he felt bound to write to Mr. Spurgeon and thank him for having "saved his soul." This had occurred, the writer went on to say, when Mr. Spurgeon addressed him in the sermon *personally*; and he could not sufficiently express his sense of obligation. He was happy, doing well on the farm, and so forth. Spurgeon remarked that the sermon referred to must have been one in which he had called upon the young men and young women present as "You, John—You, Tom—You, Bill—You, Mary—Jane—Susan," and so on, to abandon whatever vices they had and to embrace religion. The "Tom" who wrote this letter, supposing himself to be individually addressed, had taken the matter seriously to heart. Spurgeon was glad that he had done so.

Spurgeon told me that many individuals remembered him personally whom he had forgotten. Thus, on one occasion, a man stepped forward as he was passing out of church, announced his name, and grasped the preacher fervently by the hand. "I see," said he, "that you have forgotten me, sir; and yet you once did me the greatest service that a clergyman can render to anybody."

"What service was that?" said Spurgeon.

"You buried my wife, sir," replied the man, his eyes suffused with tears.

At a breakfast-party in London the guests had been for some time in the drawing-room before going in to breakfast, when the host said to me: "We are waiting for the Bishop of Winchester [Wilberforce], but if he does not appear soon, we will go in without him." At last the bishop was announced. He entered the room with a hurried, nervous air, as if somewhat agitated.

"You are late, bishop," said our host, Earl G——.

"*Late!*" exclaimed the bishop; "the wonder is that I am here at all."

At this we gathered about him to hear what had happened. He said that he had come on foot, and that when about to cross

Pall Mall a hansom cab, with two men in it, attempted to run him over. He firmly believed it was the intention of the two occupants to take his life in this way. Then, starting back as if greatly surprised, he pointed at two of the guests—very distinguished men, who were personal friends of his—and exclaimed: "I declare, if there are not the very two chaps!" Upon this there was a general laugh, the company perceiving that the bishop was only indulging in one of his habitual jokes. "It's a great shame," continued Wilberforce, with assumed gravity, "that, whilst the proud man drives, the poor man who has to go on foot cannot be allowed to do so in safety."

In personal appearance the bishop was not imposing, being under the average height. His face was intellectual and did not indicate the keen sense of humor he possessed. This quality he seemed to keep in abeyance for appropriate occasions. Of the many sayings attributed to him I remember the following: On being asked, during a moral discussion, what he considered the best way to heaven, he replied: "Turn to the right and keep straight on."

While on a visit to a country house a carriage party was made up for a drive and the bishop was urged to join it, but he insisted on walking, and started off on foot by himself. On the road the carriage party passed him as he was trudging along, and one of the company shouted out to him, quoting from Watts's hymn:

> "How blest is he who ne'er consents
> By ill advice to *walk*."

To whom the bishop shouted back, completing the stanza:

> "Nor stands in sinners' ways, nor *sits*
> Where men profanely talk."

Dr. Thomson, Archbishop of York, who died recently, apart from his commanding position, was noted for remarkable intellectual abilities. Several years ago, having a letter of introduction to Mrs. Thomson from a relative of hers residing abroad, I and my wife received a cordial invitation to visit them at Bishopsthorp, a few miles from the old cathedral town of York. We found there a small party of guests, and our stay of a few days was extremely interesting.

It was at the dinner-table, or, rather, after the ladies had withdrawn and when His Grace pushed back his chair from the table

and crossed his purple legs to compose himself for free-and-easy conversation, that I thought him at his best. It was the hour when, relieved from official restraint and the daily weight and annoyances of clerical life, he unbent for social intercourse and discussed matters having no possible relation to his particular calling, and frequently enlivened the chit-chat with pertinent and amusing anecdotes.

The archbishop asked me one day, when we were alone, about the social habits of the American clergy at home, and explained his motive for putting the question by narrating the following incident. He once received a letter from an American bishop, then travelling in England, enclosing an introduction in behalf of himself and another bishop who were visiting Europe in company. They were both from a remote Western State. The archbishop responded at once by letter to the address given, and invited them to visit him at York, requesting his correspondents to reply if the day appointed would suit their convenience, and, if not, to name the day when he might expect them. To this letter no answer was received. Several weeks, if not, indeed, months, passed without a word from the travellers, and the archbishop, concluding that his own or the others' letter had miscarried, dismissed the matter from his mind. One day the servant announced to His Grace that two travellers, each carrying a handbag and covered with dust, were waiting in the hall. They proved to be the two American bishops, who thus presented themselves *sans façon*, in acknowledgment of their host's invitation. The only explanation offered for this sudden and unlooked-for appearance was that they thought "any time" would do for their visit, and so postponed it until their return journey through England made it more convenient to take York on their way. Unfortunately, the house was full of visitors at the time, and it was only by putting the members of the family to personal inconvenience that rooms were provided for the two unexpected guests. With the exception of having the dust removed from their travelling costumes, they appeared at dinner, during the days of their stay at Bishopsthorp, in the same clothes in which they arrived.

It is only by obtaining a personal glimpse of the interior lives and occupations of the highest class of English clericals that one perceives how grave a mistake it is to assume that the mitre, the

pomp, the power, and the enormous salaries which accompany such positions are unmixed honors or blessings. So far as my observations went, the two archbishops of England not only felt acutely the vast responsibility of their office, but were among the hardest workers in the land. The demands upon their time, patience, and purse are beyond calculation, and it often happens that, so far as pecuniary matters are concerned, the higher the prelate the poorer are the means at his disposal. The late Archbishop of York was no exception to this rule, and on one occasion he lamented to me his inability to visit the United States—something he greatly desired to do—because of the expense. One item alone he thought would prevent it, namely, the extra premium he would be called upon to pay on his life-assurance policy!

Dr. Thomson owed his elevation to Prince Albert, on whom and the Queen his imposing appearance and eloquent preaching had made an impression. He was not, however, the only candidate in the field, as appears in a letter from the late Lord Houghton to his wife, published in the latter's memoirs. Houghton writes: "The Dean of Windsor told us that the sharpest bishop-making the Queen ever had was when she rejected Waldegrave for York, and Lord Palmerston told her she knew nothing about it and she answered, 'No more do you,' and she named your Ebor."

There is an amusing story in this connection which, as coming from Mrs. Thomson herself, is worth repeating, even if it has already appeared in print. When Dr. Thomson was bishop of Gloucester he was occasionally a sufferer from toothache, and resorted, by medical advice, to narcotics to relieve the pain. One morning, after a night of great suffering, he left the house to consult the doctor; Mrs. Thomson entreating him not to allow the latter to prescribe a narcotic, as it affected his brain for some hours afterwards. On his way the bishop met the postman, who handed him a large official envelope. He opened it in the street and read, to his surprise and gratification, his appointment to the see of York. He hastened back to communicate to his wife the exciting news. "Zoe—Zoe," he exclaimed, "what do you think has happened? I am Archbishop of York!"

"There! there!" she rejoined; "what did I tell you? You've been taking that horrid narcotic again and are quite out of your head."

CHARLES K. TUCKERMAN.

DOGS AND THEIR AFFECTIONS.

BY OUIDA.

An English writer has declared that, in view of the moral advantages which man enjoys from constant intimacy with the dog, the former has not derived all the benefits he might have done from contact with the latter. This is one of those jests which is not without its substance and suggestion in fact. The dog does continually display qualities from which man may with advantage mould his own conduct, and in unselfishness the canine animal leaves the human animal far behind him.

There is a charming story by Louis Enault, called the "*Chien du Capitaine,*" which I should wish every one who cares for dogs to read, and which would, even in those who do not care for them, awaken sympathy with the loyal, rough-coated, four-footed hero in his troublous Odyssey from Senegal to Normandy. A French critic once gravely objected to a story of this kind on the score that *un chien ne pourrait pas penser.* Now, that a dog can and does think, and think to much purpose, there can be no doubt whatever in those who have studied dogs in life with sympathy and attention. I am quite sure that a dog thinks in exactly the same manner as ourselves, although in a different measure. Sight and hearing being supplemented in him by that wonderful sensibility of the olfactory nerves conferring on him a sixth sense of which we can form but a very vague conception, the dog's views, actions, antipathies, attachments, and judgment of all events, places, and persons are colored and guided by what this delicate and marvellous set of nerves tells him about them. The physiologist who destroyed the nerves of a dog's nose destroyed in him all powers of discrimination, selection, and attachment, and, without the cruel operation, might have known that he would do so. It is impossible for us to measure the innumerable and sensitive impressions conveyed by the olfactory nerves to the canine brain; but that on receiving these impressions this brain thinks exactly as the human brain thinks there can be no doubt in any one who is accustomed to study dogs. I have seen a dog stand-

ing in a doorway looking up and down and pondering which way it would be most agreeable to take, precisely as a lounger will stand on the steps of his club and meditate whether he shall turn to the right or to the left.

Dogs have very strongly-marked volition, inclination, and powers of choice, and their wishes are too often neglected and set aside or brutally thwarted. The general idea of a well-brought-up dog is a dog that is cowed out of all will of his own; but it is only in leaving the animal much of his own will that the interesting characteristics of his idiosyncrasy can be studied and enjoyed. A dog who is afraid is a dog who has been robbed of the frank charm of his original temper; he becomes hesitating and sad, if he does not become sullen, and is so timid lest he should offend that all his delightful impulsiveness disappears; instead of a varied and most interesting individuality, you have a mere machine wound up and moved by the single spring of fear.

Men too often forget that all which they command is against the nature of the dog, opposed to his instincts, oppressive to his desires; and they should be infinitely more gentle and forbearing than they are in the imposition of their orders. The most entirely amusing, delightful, and affectionate dogs that I have ever known have been the most completely insubordinate. They were tiresome, no doubt, sometimes; but, in compensation, how droll, how interesting, how devoted, how beautiful in their lithe, free attitudes, how gay and how good-humored in their sportiveness!

With our dogs, as with our human friendships and affections, to enjoy much we must sacrifice something. We must like the animal for himself as well as for ourselves. There is as much difference in the characters of dogs as in those of men. I have known many, but I have never known two alike.

I see with utter disapprobation and regret all the tendency of modern times to make the dog into a chattel to gamble with in a minor degree as the horse is made in a greater sense. All the shows and prizes and competitions and heartburnings, all the advertisements of stud dogs and pedigrees and cups won by this dog and by that, are injurious to the dog himself, tend to make external points in him of a value wholly fictitious, and to induce his owners to view him with feelings varying in ratio with his success or failure at exhibitions. The physical sufferings endured by dogs at these shows, the long journeys, the privations, the separation from

places and persons dear to them, the anxiety and sorrow entailed on them,—all these things are injurious to them and are ill compensated by the questionable good done to the race by the dubious value of conflicting verdicts on the excellence of breed and form.

The Maltese (called in French the Havanais) dog has been ruined in England by the absurd decree of the judges at dog-shows that the hair of this breed should have no curl or wave in it. On the contrary, a perfect Maltese or lion-dog should have undulating hair, fine and soft as floss silk, curling at the ends and when brushed out surrounding his body with a snowy cloud.

This most beautiful of all small dogs was a fashionable pet from the days of Louis XIII. to the Revolution, and in all pictures in which he is portrayed (he was termed *chien du manchon*) the hair is waving and curling at the ends. The decree also of dog-show judges that there should be no fawn in the ears is an error; for in the most perfect specimens of this breed, which are to be found in Italy, the fawn-colored tips are often seen. I wish that I could restore the exquisite lion-dog to its place in fashion, usurped so unfittingly by the squat, clumsy, deformed dachshund, who is as ugly as he is out of place on the cushion of a carriage or a boudoir. The lion-dog is admirable, beautiful, and his aristocratic appearance, his little face which has a look of Gainsborough's and Reynolds's children, his white silken coat, and his descent from the darlings of Versailles and Whitehall, all make him an ideal dog for women. He is of high courage and of great intelligence; take him all in all, there is no dog his equal, and this little tender patrician will fight till he drops.

The dog I have cared most for in my life was of this breed; his name, Ali, had been corrupted into Lili; he was lovely to the sight, passionately devoted in affection, and of incomparable courage. He lived with me for nine years, which were as happy years to him as it was possible for a dog to know, and he lies in his last sleep between two magnolia-trees under a marble sun-dial, on whose base a famous and noble poet has written his epitaph:

> "Ecquid est quod jure docemus amabile?
> Nos amat, et nobis esse fidele potest,
> Lili, pelle canis, data sunt tibi pelle sub ista,
> Digna fides hominis pectore dignus Amor."

Which for the unlearned may be roughly translated as meaning that there is nothing so precious to us as the heart which loves

and responds to ours, and that such a heart was Lili's, although clothed in a canine form.

The Maltese, the most patrician of all small dogs, was, as I have said, at the height of his fashion in the years immediately preceding the French Revolution, and the little dog with which the poor little dauphin used to play in the gardens of Tuileries was of this race. What became of this royal pet? How many poor little pet dogs must have been left to starve and shiver homeless in those dread years, whilst their graceful and stately mistresses and masters were dragged in the tumbril to the scaffold! Dogs suffer from the *contre-coup* of all human misfortunes; and when death or adversity breaks up a home, the dog who was happy in it is one of the first and greatest losers by the calamity.

Not long ago in Paris a poor acrobat died, unknown and unregarded except by the three dogs who had belonged to and performed with him in the streets, a greyhound, a poodle, and a water-spaniel. These three poor mourners followed his coffin to its pauper's rest, and when the earth was thrown in on him they waited about the spot mournfully until the guardian of the place chased them away; and then they quietly, with their heads and tails hung low, went back into the crowds of the great city which had no home in it all for them. What became of them? One shudders to think of the torture-trough of the physiologists which was probably their doom. I learned their story too late to be able to trace and find them. Very likely the dead man had been a brute to them; but they had loved him.

The black poodle has almost superseded the larger white poodle in the affections of society; yet the white one is incomparably the finer animal. The big white poodles of Florence are very handsome and marvellously clever; but, poor fellows! they are not "in demand," and therefore they grow rarer every year. The Pomeranian is a most charming small dog, and his high spirit and extreme intelligence make him a very valuable guard. There is an electric quality in his hair which repels dust and dirt; and in intensity of attachment he cannot be surpassed. The Italian *lupetto* is often mistaken for a Pomeranian, but there is a marked difference between them. The *lupetto* does not possess the thick, short, woolly undercoat which is the characteristic of the Pomeranian, and his hair droops, while the Pomeranian's stands out from his body. The *lupetto* is, there can be no doubt, the

same breed of dog as was especially sacrificed in the Floralian games in classic Rome: at that time the Pomeranian was peaceably leading a wild and free life in the dread solitudes of those chilly lands in which Ovid fretted his heart out till it broke.

A very beautiful dog little known outside his country is the Siberian greyhound: of great size, with all the greyhound's elegance and swiftness, but with long silky hair, usually of a silvery whiteness or of a silvery grey, and a plumed tail like a large ostrich feather, this most graceful of all dogs is of incomparable beauty and deserves to be known on this side of the Caucasus.

The Siberian and the Persian greyhounds are one and the same breed; called *sleughi* in Persia and Arabia, and famous for being sent out to the chase alone. In speed this dog can outstrip the antelope and in tenacity he out-tires the tiger. Yet when brought into domesticity as a house-dog he is gentle and interesting, and forms a most picturesque ornament lying on a bearskin in a hall or *salon*. He has the black, melting, soft eye of the eastern, and the finest tapering muzzle, with small cocked, pendent ears. He is much larger than the European greyhound or deerhound. An exhibition of these dogs in Petersburg is a most picturesque sight, accompanied as they are by their Circassian or Persian huntsmen, and usually lying on scarlet carpet laid down to set off their contours and the silvery hue of their hair: a very different spectacle from the painful exhibitions of dog-shows in other countries.

As the German workman is everywhere in both hemispheres elbowing out the Englishman and Frenchman and American, so the Ulmhound and the dachshund are displacing the Maltese, the King Charles, the Blenheim, the water-spaniel, the Italian greyhound, and others. The Blenheim spaniel is a beautiful little dog, greatly neglected, whilst squab, unlovely Japanese, and bandy-legged basset hounds hold public favor, merely because they are something new and grotesque. All the handsome old breeds of spaniels grow rarer every day, and the ugly, short-haired German breeds, large and small, are pushed into public favor. The popularity of the dachshund, which would be inexplicable except that fashion can make fools of its followers as *Puck* of *Bottom*, has a disastrous effect on other breeds which better merit such honor, not only by the exclusion of these from happy homes, but by the influence which their deformity exercises on female dogs. The female is easily influenced through her eyes; without any contact with her,

a dog which takes her fancy will influence the appearance of the puppies with which she is already pregnant, and the bandy legs of the dachshund are becoming terribly traceable in breeds with which he has nothing to do. Let us hope that the caprices of society will soon send him back to the earth-stopping and badger-drawing which are his natural occupations, and restore the beautiful, aristocratic, long-haired races to their proper place in hall and palace. The liking for short-haired dogs grows out of laziness; the long-haired breeds take more time to wash and comb and keep clean, and so they fall out of public favor. Yet what is more delightful in all dogdom than a Skye terrier, with his shining eyes in a mop of hair, or what more admirable in dignity and grandeur than a Newfoundland, with the snow or the sea foam on his curls?

I once owned the grandest and biggest Newfoundland in Europe. He was bigger than the Prince of Wales's then famous Cabot; he was truly a monument of beauty and of strength; and when for dinner-parties he wore a broad blue garter ribbon, he looked indeed a very king of dogs. Withal gentle as a dove, playful as a child, using his immense strength as lightly as his own seas will toy with a summer breeze; good-natured and generous to other dogs; kind to women and children; to man good-humoredly indifferent; a tireless swimmer in any seas, swimming so matchlessly that it was beautiful to watch him fighting his way through angry breakers. "All that for a dawg!" said a London rough who saw his body being laid in its coffin; and the dead dog was a grander creature than the living brute who jeered at him.

Many memories of dogs that I have loved come to me as I write —dear, kind, forgiving, and too short-lived friends! We are not grateful enough to dogs; not patient enough or generous enough; and when they give us their whole souls, we cast them grudgingly a crumb of thought.

It has often been mooted as a vexed question why all men of genius or greatness are so fond of dogs. The reason is not far to seek. Those who are great or eminent in any way find the world full of parasites, toadies, liars, fawners, hypocrites: the incorruptible candor, loyalty, and honor of the dog are to such like water in a barren place to the thirsty traveller. The sympathy of your dog is unfailing and unobtrusive. If you are sad, so is

he ; and if you are merry, none is so willing to leap and laugh with you as he. For your dog you are never poor ; for your dog you are never old ; whether you are in a palace or a cottage he does not care ; and fall you as low as you may, you are his providence and his idol still. The attachment of the dog to man outweighs and almost obliterates attachment in him to his own race. There is something shocking to our high opinion of him in the callousness with which he will sniff at the stiff body of a brother-dog : he will follow his master to the grave, and sometimes die on it ; but the loss of his own kind leaves him unmoved.

I never knew more than one exception to this : it was, however, a noteworthy one. I had two puppies of the Molussus, commonly called the Maremma, breed ; large, white, very beautiful dogs, with long hair ; varying in size between a Newfoundland and a collie ; the old Greek race of watch-dogs to which, quite certainly, Argos belonged. These puppies, named Pan and Paris, lived together, fed, played, and slept together, and were never separated for a moment for seven months. In the seventh month Paris fell ill of distemper and died. Now, by my own observation I can declare that Pan nursed his brother as assiduously as any boy could have nursed another ; licked him, cleaned him, brought him tempting bits to eat ; did all that he could think of, and when his brother at last lay there cold and unresponsive to his efforts, his grief and astonishment were painful to see. From that time he ceased to play; from being a very lively dog he grew grave and sad; he had a wistful, wondering inquiry in his eyes which it was pathetic to behold; and although he lived for many years after, and was as happy as a dog can be, he never recovered his spirits: he had buried his mirth in the grave of Paris. Something was lost for him with his brother which he never regained. This is the only instance I have known of a dog's love for another dog.

It is by his attachment to man that the dog has become the victim of man's (and women's) capricious fancies. The cat, distinctly inferior to the dog, has yet by sheer force of character kept for herself an extraordinary amount of personal liberty. No power of man has been able to restrain her from making night hideous with her amorous serenades ; from vagabondizing and brawling and hunting as she pleases. She is in civilization, but she is not of it ; at least, is so no more than she thinks it worth

her while to be; she will accept its satin coverlid and its saucer of milk, but with the distinct reservation that she does not surrender the fair freedom of the housetop and the barbaric joy of the mouse's nest in the hedgerow. The egotism and philosophy of her character have preserved this charter for her; and the generous, impulsive, romantic, and devoted temper of the dog has, on the contrary, hurried and harried him into captivity. The cat is capable of attachment, too; but first and foremost is that determination to have her own way which procures for every egotist so much immunity and enjoyment, and is to the temperament in which it prevails as are his horn and armor to the rhinoceros. Who thinks of muzzling the cat? of chaining her? of taxing her? Heaven forbid that any one should, poor soul! but the fact remains that it is the pliability and docility of the dog's idiosyncrasy which have made him the subject of these persecutions. Man knows that his dog will forgive him anything; and he takes advantage of that long-suffering devotion. The dog suffers frightfully from being chained; but the moment he is loosed, instead of tearing to pieces those who chained him, he is solely occupied with expressing joy and gratitude at his release.

That it ever entered into the mind of man to chain a creature so vivacious, so mercurial, and so born for freedom as the dog, can only be explained by the facility with which human sophism reconciles itself to any brutuality which it considers saves it trouble. The same diabolical selfishness which sets little children to work in factories and machine-rooms chains up the dog and leaves him to fret out his life in confinement. If legislation must meddle with dogs at all, would that it would make all muzzles and chains unlawful!

The veterinarian, Bênion, who is by no means tender to the dog, yet in his work on the "Races Canines" insists again and again on the hygienic necessity of absolute liberty for all dogs; averring that, unless they can take what exercise they like, it is impossible for them to satisfy their natural desires and wants. He speaks of the troops of dogs in Norway, in Newfoundland, and throughout the East, amongst which rabies is unknown, because, although subject to great privations, they are never deprived of their freedom, and males and females live together at their will. The muzzle, he properly declares, in preventing the dog from opening his jaws, hanging out his tongue, biting fleas, and from

all other natural movement of his jaws, is so pernicious that no other device of human cruelty is so imbecile and so ingenious.

The famous veterinarian, Mayhew, wrote again and again in a similar sense against chains and muzzles; but prejudices die hard, and the prejudices of municipalities are tenacious and pernicious as thistles all over the world. The muzzle for dogs and the bearing-rein for horses commend themselves to men because they imagine their own safety is consulted in imposing them on the poor victims of their tyranny. Common-sense and humanity beat in vain against the closed doors of ignorance and cowardice.

The muzzle is the most ingenious, complete, and odious invention that can be conceived for obtaining the minimum of utility to the public with the maximum of torture to dogs. It torments and fevers the animal, and deprives those who own him of all pleasure in and use of him. The other day in a London police court a poor woman was arraigned for trying to drown herself; she was a victim of the "sweating system," which had made her weary of her life; a dog, passing by and seeing her drowning, had jumped in and brought her, still alive, to land. If a policeman had thus rescued her, the newspapers would have had innumerable paragraphs about his courage and humanity: the hero, being only "a passing dog," obtained no word of commendation from either journals or magistrate. Now, had this dog been impeded by a muzzle, he could not have saved the woman.

Not long ago, also in London, a retriever saved the lives of two little boys asleep in a burning house and lost his own life in going back for a third child; the newspapers did say a little in admiration of this act, but only a line or two; whereas they poured out columns of hysterical emotion over the sad fate of a nursemaid who in a London fire did as much as this dog, but no more.

I believe that the quality of a dog's affection for his human friends is but little understood or appreciated by the people who are the objects of it: sincerity and constancy, so often absent from human attachments, are its invariable characteristics. It has the profundity and the *hysterio passio* of intense emotions. When the dog is treated like a mere chattel, sold from one buyer to another, hustled from place to place, and tortured by continual severance from those he cares for, he suffers intensely, and his whole *morale* undergoes deterioration. The best managed of the so-called dogs' homes can only be a dogs' purgatory—the transi-

tion place from happiness to hell. Strange sights, strange voices, strange beds, strange associates, are a torture to the dog to an extent which the lighter and more capricious temperament of humanity cannot comprehend. A child, if he be well fed, indulged, and caressed, is consoled with great celerity for separation from those he loves. Not so the dog. He literally prefers a dinner of herbs where love is to the stalled ox where his affections are starved.

I have a little Pomeranian who is, from age, quite blind and quite deaf; yet he is instantly aware of my presence, and follows me about with unerring accuracy; to be happy he wants nothing more than to know that I am within his reach. This great love which survives the extinction of the senses, and which sheds a radiance on him through his darkness, has certainly in it all the highest attributes of spiritual affection. It is an error to suppose that dogs love those who feed them. I never feed this little dog; and to the person who does feed him he is quite indifferent. His love is a purely spiritual and disinterested sentiment. When I stretch my hand out to him in a new glove, he is for a moment uncertain; then remembering, evidently, that gloves go to the elbow, he sniffs at the top of my arm and satisfies himself thus of my identity. His antipathies are as strong as his attachments, and when any one whom he dislikes enters his presence, he is instantly aware of it, and "goes for" his enemy with unerring accuracy. He is both deaf and blind certainly; but in virtue of that marvellous power of scent and intensity of emotion he is as active and animated as if his beautiful black eyes had light in them and his delicate pointed ears had sound. Poor little doggie, weighted with the ills that smote Milton and Beethoven! Those great men could scarcely have had a greater soul than his.

And it is this greatness of soul which makes the dog so interesting, so mysterious, and so pathetic a personality to me, associated, as it is, with the frank animation of their bodies and the sad servitude in which they are generally kept by the human beings whom they adore. About the dog there is to me something of the faun, of the forest-god, of the mingling of divinity and brutality such as met in the shape of Pan, of an earlier, fresher, wilder world than ours; and from the eyes of the dog, in their candid worship, in their wistful appeal, in their inscrutable profundity, there is an eternal and unanswerable reproach.

OUIDA.

THE IDEAL SUNDAY.

BY THE REV. CHARLES H. EATON, D. D.

It is the purpose of the writer of this article to consider the ideal Sunday, and the effect upon it of the Sunday opening of museums, art-galleries, and music-halls. It will be admitted by all that the ideal Sunday must afford rest. We may accept or deny the authority of the fourth commandment, we might even question the existence of God, and yet agree upon the necessity of making Sunday a day of rest. The teaching of the Bible and of science is identical upon this point. Rest is essential. The division into weeks, with one day in seven set apart for rest, exists throughout the world.

The Mosaic command, however it may have arisen,—as an inspiration from God, or from human observation and experience,—is not arbitrary, but natural. More and better work is done by laboring six days and resting on the seventh. In 1832 a commission was appointed by the House of Commons "to inquire into the comparative results of working seven days in the week and working six with one rest-day." The testimony of physicians, business men, and artisans was uniform: "one day in seven is thrown in as compensation to perfect the animal system." In 1853, 641 medical men in England declared: "The seventh day of rest is essential to the bodily health and mental vigor of men in every station in life."

During the Civil War Abraham Lincoln showed his usual common-sense in the issuing of an army order reducing to a minimum the Sunday labor of army and navy, because of "the importance for man and beast of a prescribed weekly rest." It is evident that, viewed from the side of economics alone, the demand that, so far as possible, Sunday shall be a day of rest from labor is justified.

But there is a higher and more conclusive reason for providing

rest-days. It is found in the effect upon character of continuous labor. Seven days' incessant toil in every week pursued throughout the year will inevitably destroy manhood and womanhood, and reduce laborers to slavery. Leisure is as important as labor. Only by changing lines of thought and activity, by substituting home for shop, social intercourse for silent industry, the open fields for stifling factories, and rational recreation for six days of money-getting, can man preserve his health and realize for himself and his family the true end of living. When we learn that there are a million and a half wage-workers in the United States deprived of a rest-day, the importance of our subject is forced upon us. There are works of necessity which must be performed on Sunday. The more complete civilization, the larger the amount of labor required. But, so far as possible, on Sunday the wheels of industry should cease to roll, the cry of trade should be hushed, and with suspended traffic should come leisure, rest.

The ideal Sunday will also afford opportunity for mental and moral elevation. Man has not merely animal, but mental and moral, capacity; he has social instincts. Any arrangement of the days of the week which denies him opportunity to train his mind and develop his moral qualities is contrary to his highest good, and condemned both by reason and religion. Life alone justifies life. To force men and women into a prison-house by the denial of the weekly rest-day would be slowly but surely to rob humanity of its noblest instincts and powers. There is nothing sadder than to see a man or a woman converted into a machine, a burden-bearer. Hunger and cold are the hardest taskmasters. Routine makes the most miserable, as the most numerous, slaves. Homes out of which parental love has been crowded by the demands of toil; palaces of sin, the outgrowth of sensuous life, which want of leisure has fostered; individual hearts and lives, blank, selfish, or cruel, are witnesses to the need, not only of a day of rest, but to the necessity of making it a day of mental and moral awakening and refreshing.

But it is not only the poor who are coerced by the simple but inexorable demands of hunger and cold who need one day in seven for intellectual and moral cultivation. The rank and file of business men who are making the great accumulations of wealth so necessary to our civilization are also depriving themselves of the highest fruits of life. They are being unconsciously vulgar-

ized by money-getting. The mind is narrowed so as to run in one channel alone. The wings of imagination are clipped. Conscience is weighted. Symmetry of character is sacrificed to the demands of professional and commercial life. To the poor by necessity, to the rich by choice, nature is an unknown kingdom ; science, hieroglyphic ; poetry, music, art, closed chambers of delights. Domestic and social joys are foreign products on which there is an embargo. Philanthropy is a necessary evil. The only thing that appeals to them is the making of money, which, when obtained, can do little to add to manhood and womanhood and the joy of living. The ideal Sunday will give men opportunity to educate themselves in science, history, and art. It will unveil nature, create friendship, nurture domestic love and social sympathy. It will stand as a constant protest against a merely material life, as a school for mental and moral training, as an inspiration to self-sacrifice and service.

Again, the ideal Sunday will be a day of worship, in which some portion of its hours will be devoted to the training and perfecting of man's spiritual instincts and powers. The spirit of worship is natural to man. The disposition to adore is a part of the structure of the soul. It is as old as the records of humanity. It will not cease until wonder and awe die out of men's hearts and the sense of the Infinite is removed. Man has real relations to an invisible world. He has a spiritual nature. He hears the call of duty. He has the capacity to know and revere God, and the power to enlarge that knowledge and reverence. Deity is found not only in the temple, but in the counting-house. He may be worshipped on the hill-side and in the grove, as well as by the chancel and in the church. But by stated or casual services by consecrated altar or under majestic mountain, on land or on sea, some seasons and places should compel thought on eternal truths and cultivate in us the sentiment of faith and love.

The supreme object in living is the creation of a perfect character. This is salvation in the Christian teaching. It involves so great an effort of will, so rare a patience, so determined a consecration, that it cannot be left to the odd moments of six days of competitive business and rapid pleasure. Sunday as a day upon which the spirit of worship is fed and trained is necessary to stimulate and refresh the feelings of reverence, obligation, gratitude, and trust in the Infinite. On the ideal Sunday, then,

in place of the roar of trade and the clamor of gain should be heard the grand swell of organ, the chant of penitence and praise, the joyful response of old and young, exposition, exhortation, the arousing of conscience, the consecration to the service of God and man.

Not even extremists can deny that among the elements that enter into the ideal Sunday are rest, mental and moral elevation, and worship. Reason and religion unite in commendation of such a use of Sunday.

Now let us ask, In what relation does the opening of museums, music-halls, and art-galleries stand to the ideal Sunday? Does it violate the first condition, rest? So far as the wage-workers are concerned (and it is in their interest that the plea for closing is made), certainly not. Rest is not idleness, but change. The truest rest that could come to the laborer is to fill his mind with new objects of delight, to charm his eye and ear, and invigorate his will. To withdraw men from straitened circumstances and homes of want, and put them in clean, warm, and well-lighted museums, galleries of art, and music-halls, would be to give real rest to toiling millions.

There can be no objection urged against this plan because of those who are employed as care-takers and attendants. In the first place, these are few in numbers. Then they would be employed but a few hours in the day, and at a time that would not interfere with worship. In addition to this, they could enjoy another rest-day during the week. But there is even a better plan than this which a little self-sacrifice would make practicable. The rich and the well-to-do who have leisure could take the places of attendants, and perhaps give simple talks on the objects of art and history which should engage the attention of visitors. What new sympathy would result from such a mingling of classes in these institutions! How greatly it would assist in binding together the members of the family of God! How certainly it would aid in beating down suspicion, pride, and jealousy! Open these buildings at two o'clock, giving all who desire opportunity to attend morning services in places of public worship. Close all places of public amusement established as business ventures and which charge admission for private profit. Without money and without price throw open the treasure-houses of art, science, and history.

Give also free concerts for the people, where not only "Old Hundred" and Gregorian chants shall be sung and played, but all real music. For all real music has moral significance. If such a course caused extra expense, it would be gladly defrayed by the philanthropic, and the loss of sectarian endowment would be more than compensated for in the general and popular increase of patronage and support. There are sufficient economic and social reasons for taking this position. Thus shall we best satisfy the first condition of an ideal Sunday, rest.

What would be the effect so far as the second condition, mental and moral elevation, is concerned? It is evident that right here museums open on Sunday could yield a most important influence for good. To take the laborer away from the narrow and often repellent circle of his life; to show him objects of beauty; to delight the eye with splendid color and delicate drawing; to ravish the ear with sound and tune; to invoke loyalty to country by patriotic airs; to bring tears to his eye by pathetic song or reading,—all these results are substantial gains. To stretch the horizon of a hovel to the limits of history; to turn the gaze from rags and filth to the silent and fathomless heavens dotted with stars; to forget the roar of business, and the querulous cry of sick child, and the overpowering heat of confined tenement-house, in gazing on pictures of natural scenery, cool, fresh, and free; to break up iron routine; to give food for thought and substance for dreams, is to bring about large mental and moral change. It is to quicken the imagination, train reason and memory. It is to elevate and arouse the conscience and give scope for the moral nature. Shut off the view of the poor-house with the palace of art! Drive out the hate of man with the blessed mother-look of the Madonna! In place of croaking voice, oaths, and lamenting cries, fill the air, for at least one day in the week, with ballads, secular compositions, and religious chants.

One of the signs of the growing recognition of this opportunity is the whisper that has reached our ears that the managers of a great music-hall recently dedicated will arrange for such free concerts for the people as have been suggested. All these influences made active on Sunday would break the rock in human hearts and bring forth the waters of joy and loftier life.

But will not the Sunday opening of museums interfere with worship, cut the cords of religion, and send the community adrift

on a sea of materialism and scepticism? There are doubtless some who sincerely think this would be the result. But the fear is groundless. Such a movement would in the long run fill the churches, increase the active forces of morality and religion, and create a predisposition in favor of church and church methods that would be irresistible. The chief support of the church of Christ must be found among the masses. If the people think the church is forgetful of them or irresponsive to their needs, then the existing chasm between church-goers and non-church-goers will widen. Encourage attendance at church in the morning and open the museums in the afternoon. The museums will thus be transformed into the vestibules of churches. Let clergymen and laymen speak at gatherings in these places. Who can overestimate the beneficial results? What better pulpit than the platform of art-gallery or music-hall? What better texts than marble statue of god and hero, splendid picture, curious column from ancient days, fossil of extinct animal, and model of temple and shrine? What nobler preachers than whole-souled artists, inspired singers, musicians, reverent lovers of science? We need all these aids in the religious life. Why do we neglect them? Why discrown these spiritual kings and crucify these saviours of a darkened world?

A narrow conception of salvation is responsible for this serious error of sincere Christians. Salvation is in some sense special and peculiar. But surrender to God, the obedience of the law of righteousness and mercy, its essential element, is brought about in many ways. It may be approached from different quarters of experience. There are many and contrasted methods by which the mind and the heart are prepared for the incoming of the spirit. Many agencies are required to make the soil ready for the seeds of truth. It is evident that men can be reached only by sympathy. To give them leisure for thought and rest, to train the mind, to interest them in something above bread and butter, is to open the door through which the spiritual sentiments and the supreme passion for God enter. God is found in many ways. It has been taught that he can be found in but one way, and that our way. All places enshrine him. Not all his altars are dedicated to prayer and sermon. Rightly understood, all created things speak of and lead to God. Thus enlarging our view, we may at one time magnify the of-

fices of the church and at the same time defend open museums, galleries of art, and music-halls as appropriate means of Sunday instruction and grace.

It is evident from a candid examination of the subject, not only that the Sunday opening of such places of rational recreation as have been described would not undermine the ideal Sunday, but that it would place it upon a surer and more permanent basis. A fair trial of such a plan as has been indicated would give opportunity for rest, mental and moral elevation, and worship to a far larger extent than at present, and completely justify the defender of larger liberty for Sunday.

CHARLES H. EATON.

REFLECTIONS OF AN ACTRESS.

BY CLARA MORRIS.

In the morning at rehearsal an actor is like a caterpillar, plain to look upon, nibbling this leaf or that, moving slowly, laboriously, from point to point; in the afternoon, having withdrawn from the world, for rest, for thought, he is a chrysalis; while at night he flutters forth a many-tinted, broad-winged butterfly.

Yet the public are not content to watch the pretty flitting of this handsome fellow from one glowing blossom to another; they want to know upon what leaves he fed as a caterpillar, and, above all, what did he do, what did he think, while shut up *en chrysalide*.

Formerly, when theatres were few and the plays were of ancient date, with the scenes laid in foreign countries, when actors trailed about in ermine and glittered in jewels the size of pigeons' eggs, there was a certain mystery about stage people. The men stalked about in solemn silence; the women were discreetly veiled. If the beautiful young heroine of the play was the mother of a brood of little ones, no one knew it. If the arch-traitor and villain, who simply waded in gore at night, was but a kindly old body, fond of giving pennies to babies, no one knew it. But in these days of numerous theatres and of modern plays: in which actors wear the clothes of to-day,—above all, since the interviewer has been loose in the land,—the heart of our mystery has been plucked out. We are simply a body of every-day men and women who go about their business in a most business-like way.

But as there are children who are only happy with a toy while they are on a still hunt for the "squeak," so there are people who have torn their toy—the theatre—so far apart as to lay bare all its machinery,—its traps, rain-box, thunder-sheet, paper-snow machine, practical moon, etc., and yet they are not contented:

now they turn their attention to "the squeak." Understanding perfectly the construction of that beautiful canvas and paint garden basking in the electric sunlight, they want now to know just how the butterfly got out of that dry shell, and how, oh, how, did he get his wings.

I am no butterfly—I lack the delicate marking, the softly-brilliant coloring. I am but a moth, a big, blundering good-natured moth, strong of wing and square of head, stumbling into a flower now and then. Yet, because I too have been a chrysalis, I too arouse curiosity.

But, jesting aside, I am going to try to answer two or three of the questions that are oftenest asked about my profession: it would be impossible to answer all of them. Here is number one:

"What qualities are absolutely necessary in a man or woman for the making of a successful actor?"

Ye who ask this question may be wise as serpents, but I dare not declare ye harmless as doves. It is too like a hand-grenade—quite harmless to the one who flings it, but apt to be a trifle confusing to the party who receives it. I have heard the question answered in various ways: one declared for a fine physique, another for a great voice, a quick memory, etc.; but for myself, I shall adopt the Yankee habit, and answer one question by asking another.

What professional actor or actress can equal the performance of little children playing at making calls? What animated and dramatic conversation they will hold with men and women impersonated by their fancy alone? What grace, what sincerity, what abandon? This can only be accounted for in one way: a versatile imagination is the chief faculty of children; not having realized a self-conscious being, they have no difficulty in passing into that of others. Therefore I claim that imagination is the chief quality required in the making of an actor; quick, volatile sympathies, open to external impressions. Imitative power all actors possess, and that brings me to the difference between the old school and the new,—the Kemble and the Irving. The first imitated; he followed in the beaten track; he was coldly careful, precise in gesture and tone; he respectfully copied every particle of the business of his predecessors in a play; he imitated, and, what is worse, he imitated another actor. Whom does Irving imitate? The man has neither the Kemble beauty nor the Kemble

voice, but, good heavens! what strength of imagination! And this is backed by great energy; he is a man of affairs, keen and shrewd, a good business man; but it is his imagination that makes a brilliant actor of him, not his shrewdness.

To the new school belongs Joseph Jefferson, of whom I always think as the poet-actor. With perceptions so delicate, sympathies so keen, enthusiasm so youthful, judgment so mature, a heart so tender, and a mind so cultivated, where are we to find his equal? An actor's proudest privilege is to add something to the character the author has drawn; and we all know that out of the plenitude of his own gentleness Joseph Jefferson has humanized and made lovable the village sot drwan by Washington Irving.

I am not claiming that imagination alone will make an actor. He must have observation as well. Let him keep his eyes open and study his fellow-men. People of different temperaments will express anger in different ways. It does not take a vast experience of life or a very close observation to discover the difference between the slow, painful tears of old age and the plenteous, passionate overflow from the eyes of youth. Was there ever a gesture that could excel, in meaning and effect, the one used by Salvini in "Morte Civile" when the escaped convict shambles slowly forward and, stretching out his arm timidly, lays his finger-tips on the priest's hand, then quickly withdraws them, and with unutterable intensity presses them to his own lips? The salutation was given with such trembling, wistful deprecation as brought tears to many eyes. When I questioned Signor Salvini about it, he said: "No, I have no invent. In my country, among the poor, down-trodden peasants, you will often see that kiss: they love, but also they fear, the priest—si—si!" This beautiful gesture, then, was the result of observation.

When, some years ago, I found myself cast for the part of *Cora*, in the play "Article 47," and learned that there was a mad scene for me to act, I was alarmed. The traditional stage maniac was a combination of rolling eyes, snorty starts, and noisy declamation, sometimes ridiculous and always a bore. Therefore tradition could not help me. When Mr. Daly, with unintentional cruelty, took me aside and informed me that everything depended on just one act,—that, to quote his exact words, "the play must stand or fall by the mad scene,"—I nearly fell there and then from the fright he gave me. The following nightmare fortnight I shall

never forget. Having learned the lines or words of my part and settled the question of the showily-rich costumes to be worn, every moment of my time was given to the study of the character Mr. Daly had intrusted to me to develop and place before his public. I regarded *Cora* as a beautiful, uneducated, half-tamed animal, a possible victim to hysteria, from the first: it was from this stand-point I made my study. But when all was done, I felt, to my dismay, a degree of uncertainty. With an anxiously exacting manager behind me and a coolly critical audience before me, to enter upon so important a task in a doubtful frame of mind was simply to court failure. For once I dared not trust to my imagination, to my sympathy. I felt I must have facts to support me, and, like the famous hook-handed captain, I must "take an observation." I then made a pilgrimage to the insane asylum on Blackwell's Island, but while there it suddenly dawned upon me that it would be a cruel and heartless act to single out for study some individual unfortunate, upon whom the hand of God was resting so heavily, and then to imitate her before a crowd of people. It would be like taking advantage of a crippled child. I felt it would be kinder and perhaps more artistic to choose two or three symptoms common to all cases of insanity, and then, by carefully presenting these general symptoms to the audience, suggest the insanity of *Cora*.

With that thought in my mind, while all the woman in me bent the head before such an aggregation of human misery, while every nerve shuddered away from the frightful sights and sounds, the actress made note of gibbering laugh, swaying body, and broken, incoherent speech. Ah me, it was dreadful! I was observing with a vengeance. Still, I had found my facts. They made a sure foundation on which to place the superstructure of imagination. I had suffered greatly from terror, hard work, and sleeplessness, but I was amply repaid; for after the first performance, not only the generous public, but my gratified manager and the very critics themselves, gave me words of praise for the work I had done, the character I had created.

It is not always easy to make one's observations. I remember that on one occasion I experienced considerable difficulty in obtaining the subject I wished to study. It was at the time that Messrs. Shook and Palmer were about to produce "Miss Multon" at the Union Square Theatre. *Miss Multon* dies, but there is in the

whole play no word which indicates the nature of the disease which causes her death.

After due consultation the powers who were decided that the lady should die of heart-disease ; a very simple matter so far as the powers were concerned, but a very difficult matter to me, who had the part to play. I knew absolutely nothing of heart-disease, nor could I find a single friend or acquaintance who could assist me. I turned to the doctor under whose care I then was, and asked his help. After some conversation he decided that *angina pectoris* was what I was looking for, as it seemed to adapt itself perfectly to the requirements of the character I described to him. He began by telling me something of the structure of the heart. He showed me some ugly pictures, too, that looked, to my eyes, like sections of ripe tomatoes with blue radishes growing through them. He taught me where my heart was located, and informed me that, in the ordinary stage gesture, when the hand seeks the heart, the aforesaid hand is something like a foot away from the sought-for organ. He minutely and repeatedly described to me the attitude and expression of one enduring, in speechless, almost breathless, agony, that awful torture called by doctors *angina pectoris*. This was to be used for the climax of the play. So far we had gone smoothly enough, but suddenly, to use a theatrical expression, the doctor "stuck." He declared his utter inability to convey to me an idea of the manner in which a patient breathes when suffering from excitement or fatigue. That was unfortunate, for it was on that symptom I most relied to indicate to the audience what was *Miss Multon's* physical condition, her eloquent language making plain her domestic woes. I begged the doctor to show me how I should breathe, but he shook his head and said, "No, no ! you must see a subject." At his next visit I saw he was vexed, and pretty soon he informed me that the only heart subject he had found was a man bearded to the eyes ; but, said he, while he savagely buttoned his coat : "I'll find you a subject, or that man's beard shall come off, for you must see that movement of nostril and mouth."

Not more than two hours after, there was a violent ring at the bell, and, glancing from the window and seeing the doctor's carriage, I hurried to the hall, and, looking down, saw a very cruel thing. The doctor and a woman were standing at the foot of the long, long staircase. Then he caught her by the arm, and, start-

ing by her side, ran her up the whole long flight of stairs. Shall I ever forget that woman's face as she stood swaying, clinging to the door frame! her ghastly, waxen pallor; the strained, scared look in her eyes; the dilating nostrils; above all, the movement of the muscles about the mouth, which contracted the upper lip at every hurtling, gasping breath! The doctor pushed by her and hastily whispered: "You are a student and not well enough to attend—" I don't know whether he said class or lecture; I was only sure of the word student. So, burning with shame, I took my cue, and going forward I felt her pulse and asked her a few appropriate questions. We were alone then for a few moments, and she told me her pitifully commonplace little story. I questioned her closely as to how anger or surprise affected her, and, finding she was very poor and had a child to care for, I slipped a bill into her hand as she rose to go. She was thanking me quietly when her eyes fell upon the figure on the bill. Instantly over her neck, her face, her ears, there flamed a color so fiercely, hotly red it seemed to scorch the skin. Her very wrists, where they were bared above her gloves, were red. Her hand flew to her side in the very gesture the doctor had been teaching me. She gave a little laugh, and nervously remarked: "I—I feel so—hot and—prickly. I suppose—I'm all red! You see—it was—the surprise—that did it! Don't look so—frightened, Miss. I haven't no pain. I ain't red neither, am I, now?" Heaven knows she was not. Her very lips were white. So, with thanks and pallid smiles, the poor soul removed herself and her fell disease from my presence, and I had received my second painful object-lesson.

The night before the production of the play, in a spirit of mischief I drew up a document for the doctor to sign, in which he acknowledged that in my study of heart-disease he had been my teacher. For, said I, should the critics attack that part of my work, you will then have to share the blame. Laughingly I brought forth my document; laughingly he signed it. The critics did not attack, but I still keep the acknowledgment, and it bears the signature "E. C. Seguin."

I am not arguing that to be a good *Lady Macbeth* one should first commit a murder or look on while murder is committed; for, like many another character it can only be well acted when it is well known, and it can only be known through the imaginative sympathies.

In a word, then, I believe that of the many qualities required for the making of a fine actor the most important are imagination, observation, and a nice judgment in adapting one's knowledge to the requirements of the stage.

The question next oftenest asked is: "What attraction has the stage for its followers, that they are so devoted to it?" Yes, we are devoted to it. We respect its antiquity; we admire the position it has gained in the world of art; we are grateful to it for our daily bread.

One of its attractions is that it may prove a short cut to popularity. Then, people of other callings transact their business amid more or less dull surroundings and turn to their homes for that which the actor finds at the theatre alone, namely, light, warmth, music, sociability. For my part, I do not believe in a "mute, inglorious Milton." I think that all power demands expression, and the employment of power is a delight. The actor who succeeds feels he pleases his public, and therein finds his own pleasure. When triumph comes to him, it is in so delightful a guise he cannot help being moved by it. When an author places his book before the public, he must wait; he learns gradually of his success. Not so the actor. His work receives instant recognition in swift, soul-satisfying applause; and what a delicious draught it is! It produces a sort of divine intoxication, that, having once experienced, one longs to repeat.

It is curious how a performer and an audience act and react upon one another. Sometimes an actor begins his work in the highest spirits, and the coldness, the unresponsiveness, of the audience completely crush him. He feels thrown back upon himself, and for the rest of the play, however painstaking he may be, he will lack naturalness and spirit. Again, an actor goes to his task in sickness, trouble, or sorrow, quite unfit for his work, but his audience gives him a warm greeting; his heart responds instantly, his spirits rise, he decides he must do his best to please these generous people; so in trying to divert them he diverts himself, and all goes well.

Through these agencies I can in a scene of anger reach the very verge of frenzy. When, after enduring through a play every conceivable humiliation any human creature can bring upon another, I am at last brought face to face with my triumphant foe, by forcing my mind to dwell on all the cruel

wrongs thrust upon me by this individual I work myself into a state of suppressed rage that sensibly increases the beating of my heart and makes me burn all over. If my first accusing, indignant speech is followed by a sharp round of applause, the effect upon me is that of a lash from a whip to an angry horse. The blood thunders in my ears, my body vibrates under the blows of my heart ; and between great earth and greater heaven I see but one face, that of my enemy, and it gleams white through a mist of red. I have forgotten that he is Mr. X. and I Miss M. Should the exigencies of the play then demand from him a sneering or contemptuous answer to my last speech, my muscles become rigid, I am held, possessed, tormented by one intense desire—to close my hands about his throat and clench, and clench, until I may stand in that red mist alone. I am neither actress nor woman, but for just that one hot, furious moment I am *murder*. So, between the imagination and the excitement of applause, the deed is done. I forget myself, and pass into another form of being.

But my time and the space of THE REVIEW is exhausted, and the remainder of the questions, such as the temptations, frights, drolleries, of the stage, must wait.

CLARA MORRIS.

HAÏTI AND THE UNITED STATES.

INSIDE HISTORY OF THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE MÔLE ST. NICOLAS.

BY THE HON. FREDERICK DOUGLASS, LATE UNITED STATES MINISTER TO HAÏTI.

I.

I PROPOSE to make a plain statement regarding my connection with the late negotiations with the government of Haïti for a United States naval station at the Môle St. Nicolas. Such a statement seems required, not only as a personal vindication from undeserved censure, but as due to the truth of history. Recognizing my duty to be silent while the question of the Môle was pending, I refrained from making any formal reply to the many misstatements and misrepresentations which have burdened the public press unchallenged during the last six months. I have, however, long intended to correct some of the grosser errors contained in these misrepresentations, should the time ever come when I could do so without exposing myself to the charge of undue sensitiveness and without detriment to the public interest. That time has now come, and there is no ground of sentiment, reason, or propriety for a longer silence, especially since, through no fault of mine, the secrets of the negotiations in question have already been paraded before the public, apparently with no other purpose than to make me responsible for their failure.

There are many reasons why I would be gladly excused from appearing before the public in the attitude of self-defence. But while there are times when such defence is a privilege to be exercised or omitted at the pleasure of the party assailed, there are other times and circumstances when it becomes a duty which cannot be omitted without the imputation of cowardice or of conscious guilt. This is especially true in a case where the charges vitally affect one's standing with the people and govern-

ment of one's country. In such a case a man must defend himself, if only to demonstrate his fitness to defend anything else. In discharging this duty I shall acknowledge no favoritism to men in high places, no restraint but candor, and no limitation but truth. It is easy to whip a man when his hands are tied. It required little courage for these men of war to assail me while I was in office and known to be forbidden by its rules to write or to speak in my own defence: they had everything their own way.

Perhaps it was thought that I lacked the spirit or the ability to reply. On no other ground of assurance could there have been such loose and reckless disregard of easily-ascertained facts to contradict them. It is also obvious that the respectability of the public journals, rather than the credibility of the writers themselves, was relied upon to give effect to their statements. Had they disclosed their names and their true addresses, the public could have easily divined a motive which would have rendered unnecessary any word of mine in self-defence. It would have become evident, in that case, that there was a premeditated attempt to make me a scapegoat to bear off the sins of others. It may be noted, too, that prompt advantage has been taken of the fact that falsehood is not easily exposed when it has had an early start in advance of truth. As mindful of some things as they were, however, they forgot that innocence needs no defence until it is accused.

The charge is that I have been the means of defeating the acquisition of an important United States naval station at the Môle St. Nicolas. It is said, in general terms, that I wasted the whole of my first year in Haïti in needless parley and delay, and finally reduced the chances of getting the Môle to such a narrow margin as to make it necessary for our government to appoint Rear-Admiral Gherardi as a special commissioner to Haïti to take the whole matter of negotiation for the Môle out of my hands. One of the charitable apologies they are pleased to make for my failure is my color; and the implication is that a white man would have succeeded where I failed. This color argument is not new. It besieged the White House before I was appointed minister-resident and consul-general to Haïti. At once and all along the line the contention was then raised that no man with African blood in his veins should be sent as minister to the black republic. White men professed to speak in the

interest of black Haïti; and I could have applauded their alacrity in upholding her dignity if I could have respected their sincerity. They thought it monstrous to compel black Haïti to receive a minister as black as herself. They did not see that it would be shockingly inconsistent for Haïti to object to a black minister while she herself is black.

Prejudice sets all logic at defiance. It takes no account of reason or consistency. One of the duties of a minister in a foreign land is to cultivate good social as well as civil relations with the people and government to which he is sent. Would an American white man, imbued with our national sentiments, be more likely than an American colored man to cultivate such relations? Would his American contempt for the colored race at home fit him to win the respect and good-will of colored people abroad? Or would he play the hypocrite and pretend to love negroes in Haïti when he is known to hate negroes in the United States?—aye, so bitterly that he hates to see them occupy even the comparatively humble position of consul-general to Haïti. Would not the contempt and disgust of Haïti repel such a sham?

Haïti is no stranger to Americans or to American prejudice. Our white fellow-countrymen have taken little pains to conceal their sentiments. This objection to my color and this demand for a white man to succeed me spring from the very feeling which Haïti herself contradicts and detests. I defy any man to prove, by any word or act of the Haïtien Government, that I was less respected at the capital of Haïti than was any white minister or consul. This clamor for a white minister for Haïti is based upon the idea that a white man is held in higher esteem by her than is a black man, and that he can get more out of her than can one of her own color. It is not so, and the whole free history of Haïti proves it not to be so. Even if it were true that a white man could, by reason of his alleged superiority, gain something extra from the servility of Haïti, it would be the height of meanness for a great nation like the United States to take advantage of such servility on the part of a weak nation. The American people are too great to be small, and they should ask nothing of Haïti on grounds less just and reasonable than those upon which they would ask anything of France or England. Is the weakness of a nation a reason for our robbing it? Are we to take advantage, not only of its weakness, but of its fears? Are

we to wring from it by dread of our power what we cannot obtain by appeals to its justice and reason? If this is the policy of this great nation, I own that my assailants were right when they said that I was not the man to represent the United States in Haïti.

I am charged with sympathy for Haïti. I am not ashamed of that charge; but no man can say with truth that my sympathy with Haïti stood between me and any honorable duty that I owed to the United States or to any citizen of the United States.

The attempt has been made to prove me indifferent to the acquisition of a naval station in Haïti, and unable to grasp the importance to American commerce and to American influence of such a station in the Caribbean Sea. The fact is that when some of these writers were in their petticoats I had comprehended the value of such an acquisition, both in respect to American commerce and to American influence. The policy of obtaining such a station is not new. I supported General Grant's ideas on this subject against the powerful opposition of my honored and revered friend Charles Sumner, more than twenty years ago, and proclaimed it on a hundred platforms and to thousands of my fellow-citizens. I said then that it was a shame to American statesmanship that, while almost every other great nation in the world had secured a foothold and had power in the Caribbean Sea, where it could anchor in its own bays and moor in its own harbors, we, who stood at the very gate of that sea, had there no anchoring-ground anywhere. I was for the acquisition of Samana, and of Santo Domingo herself if she wished to come to us. While slavery existed I was opposed to all schemes for the extension of American power and influence. But since its abolition I have gone with him who goes farthest for such extension.

But the pivotal and fundamental charge made by my accusers is that I wasted a whole year in fruitless negotiations for a coaling-station at the Môle St. Nicolas and allowed favorable opportunities for obtaining it to pass unimproved, so that it was necessary at last for the United States Government to take the matter out of my hands and send a special commissioner to Haïti, in the person of Rear-Admiral Gherardi, to negotiate for the Môle. A statement more false than this never dropped from lips or pen. I here and now declare, without hesitation or qualification or fear of contradiction, that there is not one word of truth in this charge. If I do not in this state the truth, I may be easily con-

tradicted and put to open shame. I therefore affirm that at no time during the first year of my residence in Haïti was I charged with the duty or invested with any authority by the President of the United States, or by the Secretary of State, to negotiate with Haïti for a United States naval station at the Môle St. Nicolas or anywhere else in that country. Where no duty was imposed no duty was neglected. It is not for a diplomat to run before he is sent, especially in matters involving large consequences like those implied in extending our power into a neighboring country.

Here, then, let me present the plain facts in the case. They, better than anything else I can say, vindicate my conduct in connection with this question.

On the 26th of January, 1891, Rear-Admiral Gherardi, having arrived at Port au Prince, sent one of his under-officers on shore to the United States Legation to invite me on board his flagship, the "Philadelphia." I complied with the invitation, although I knew that, in strict politeness, it would have been more appropriate for Admiral Gherardi himself to come to me. I felt disinclined, however, to stand upon ceremony or to endeavor to correct the manners of an American admiral. Having long since decided to my own satisfaction that no expression of American prejudice or slight on account of my color could diminish my self-respect or disturb my equanimity, I went on board as requested, and there for the first time learned that I was to have some connection with negotiations for a United States coaling-station at the Môle St. Nicolas, and this information was imparted to me by Rear-Admiral Gherardi. He told me in his peculiarly emphatic manner that he had been duly appointed a United States special commissioner; that his mission was to obtain a naval station at the Môle St. Nicolas; and that it was the wish of Mr. Blaine and of Mr. Tracy, and also of the President of the United States, that I should earnestly coöperate with him in accomplishing this object. He further made me fully acquainted with the dignity of his position, and I was not slow in recognizing it.

In reality, some time before the arrival of Admiral Gherardi on this diplomatic scene, I was made acquainted with the fact of his appointment. There was at Port au Prince an individual, of whom we shall hear more elsewhere, acting as agent of a distin-

guished firm in New York, who appeared to be more fully initiated into the secrets of the State Department at Washington than I was, and who knew, or said he knew, all about the appointment of Admiral Gherardi, whose arrival he diligently heralded in advance and carefully made public in all the political and business circles to which he had access. He stated that I was discredited at Washington, had, in fact, been suspended and recalled, and that Admiral Gherardi had been duly commissioned to take my place. This news was sudden and far from flattering. It is unnecessary to say that it placed me in an unenviable position both before the community of Port au Prince and before the government of Haïti. It had, however, the advantage, so far as I was able to believe anything so anomalous, of preparing me for the advent of my successor, and of softening the shock of my fall from my high estate. My connection with this negotiation, as all may see, was very humble, secondary, and subordinate. The glory of success or the shame of defeat was to belong to the new minister. I was made subject to the commissioner. This was not quite so bad as the New York agent had prepared me to expect, but it was not what I thought I deserved and what my position as minister called for at the hands of my government. Strangely enough, all of my instructions concerning the Môle came to me through my newly-constituted superior. He was fresh from the face of our Secretary of State, knew his most secret intentions and the wants and wishes of the government, and I, naturally enough, received the law from his lips.

The situation suggested the resignation of my office as due to my honor; but reflection soon convinced me that such a course would subject me to a misconstruction more hurtful than any censure which, in the circumstances, could justly arise from remaining at my post. The government had decided that a special commissioner was needed in Haïti. No charges were brought against me, and it was not for me to set up my wisdom or my resentment as a safer rule of action than that prescribed by the wisdom of my government. Besides, I did not propose to be pushed out of office in this way. I therefore resolved to coöperate with the special commissioner in good faith and in all earnestness, and did so to the best of my ability.

It was first necessary, in furtherance of the mission of Ad-

miral Gherardi, to obtain for him as early as possible an interview with Mr. Firmin, the Haïtien Minister of Foreign Affairs, and with His Excellency Florvil Hyppolite, the President of Haïti. This, by reason of my position as minister and my good relations with the government of Haïti, I accomplished only two days after the arrival of the admiral. Not even my accusers can charge me with tardiness in obeying in this, or in anything else, the orders of my superior. In acting under him I had put aside the fact of the awkward position in which the officious agent had placed me, and the still more galling fact that the instructions I received had not reached me from the State Department in the usual and appropriate way, as also the fact that I had been in some degree subjected to the authority of an officer who had not, like myself, been duly appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate of the United States, and yet one whose name and bearing proclaimed him practically the man having full command. Neither did I allow anything like a feeling of offended dignity to diminish my zeal and alacrity in carrying out his instructions. I consoled myself with the thought that I was acting like a good soldier, promptly and faithfully executing the orders of my superior, and obeying the will of my government. Our first conference with President Hyppolite and his Foreign Secretary was held at the palace at Port au Prince on the 28th of January, 1891. At this conference, which was, in fact, the real beginning of the negotiations for the Môle St. Nicolas, the wishes of our government were made known to the government of Haïti by Rear-Admiral Gherardi; and I must do him the justice to say that he stated the case with force and ability. If anything was omitted or insisted upon calculated to defeat the object in view, this defect must be looked for in the admiral's address, for he was the principal speaker, as he was also the principal negotiator.

Admiral Gherardi based our claim for this concession upon the ground of services rendered by the United States to the Hyppolite revolution. He claimed it also on the ground of promises made to our government by Hyppolite and Firmin through their agents while the revolution was in progress, and affirmed that but for the support of our government the revolution would have failed. I supplemented his remarks, not in opposition to his views, but with the intention of impressing the government of Haïti with the idea that the concession asked for was in the line

of good neighborhood and advanced civilization, and in every way consistent with the autonomy of Haïti; urging that the concession would be a source of strength rather than of weakness to the Haïtien government; that national isolation was a policy of the past; that the necessity for it in Haïti, for which there was an apology at the commencement of her existence, no longer exists; that her relation to the world and that of the world to her are not what they were when her independence was achieved; that her true policy now is to touch the world at all points that make for civilization and commerce; and that, instead of asking in alarm what will happen if a naval station be conceded to the United States, it should ask, "What will happen if such a naval station be not conceded?" I insisted that there was far more danger to be apprehended to the stability of the existing government from allowing the rumor to float in the air that it was about to sell out the country than by granting the lease of the Môle and letting the country know precisely what had been done and the reasons in the premises for the same; that a fact accomplished carries with it a power to promote acquiescence; and I besought them to meet the question with courage.

In replying to us Mr. Firmin demanded to know on which of the two grounds we based our claim for the possession of this naval station. If it were demanded, he said, upon any pledge made by President Hyppolite and himself, he denied the existence of any such promise or pledge, and insisted that, while the offer of certain advantages had been made to our government, the government at Washington had not at the time accepted them. The letter in proof of the different view was, he said, only a copy of the original letter, and the original letter was never accepted by the American Government.

This position of Mr. Firmin's was resisted by Admiral Gherardi, who contended with much force that, while there was no formal agreement consummated between the two governments, Haïti was nevertheless morally bound, since the assistance for which she asked had made Hyppolite President of Haïti. Without intending to break the force of the admiral's contention at this point, I plainly saw the indefensible attitude in which he was placing the government of the United States in representing our government as interfering by its navy with the affairs of a neighboring country, covertly assisting in putting down one government

and setting up another; and I therefore adhered to the grounds upon which I based our demand for a coaling-station at the Môle I spoke in the interest and in support of the honor of the United States. It did not strike me that what was claimed by Admiral Gherardi to have been done—though I did not say as much—is the work for which the United States navy is armed, equipped, manned. and supported by the American people. It was alleged that, though our government did not authorize Rear-Admiral Gherardi to overthrow Légitime and to set up Hyppolite as President of Haïti, it gave him the *wink*, and left him to assume the responsibility. I did not accept this as a foundation upon which I could base my diplomacy. If this was a blunder on my part, it was a blunder of which I am not ashamed, and it was committed in the interest of my country.

At the close of this conference we were asked by Mr. Firmin to put into writing our request for the Môle, and the terms upon which we asked its concession. What followed will be told hereafter.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

IS DRUNKENNESS CURABLE?

BY DR. WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, DR. T. D. CROTHERS, DR. ELON N. CARPENTER, AND DR. CYRUS EDSON.

DR. HAMMOND:

IT MAY be stated with perfect confidence in the absolute correctness of the assertion that there is no medicine or combination of medicines that will cure a person of the habit of drunkenness—that is, that will destroy his or her habit or appetite for alcoholic liquors. It may be incidentally stated with equal positiveness that there is no habit, whether of chloral, opium, hashish, or any other intoxicating substance, that can be cured by medicine ; and, even further, that there is no habit or appetite whatever to which mankind is subject that can be got rid of by drugs, whether it be drinking coffee, or smoking tobacco, or taking a walk every day at a particular hour, or going to bed at a certain time. Appetites and habits are not under the control of medicines : nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the habit of drunkenness is curable, and that the appetite for alcohol can be abolished.

In order to demonstrate these facts it will be necessary to state, first, what the desire for alcoholic liquors is, and, secondly, how it may be cured.

Most persons get drunk because they want to ; others because they cannot help it with the means of combating their inclination which are at their disposal.

Now, in regard to the first class,—those who get drunk because they want to,—there are several motives which prompt them to excessive indulgence in alcohol. By lessening the nervous impressibility of the individual it diminishes any painful impression, mental or physical, of which he may be the subject ; it drowns his sorrows and eases his pains. Besides these effects, by stimulating certain portions of his brain it, in many cases, at

first arouses pleasurable emotions before the stage of stupor or utter forgetfulness is reached; though every one knows that in many cases it produces a state of frenzy or prompts to acts of violence. These people get drunk every day, for the habit becomes established in them, and habits when well fixed in the system are very difficult to eradicate. Still, they may be cured, and it is well if they can be cured before not only the habit has become confirmed, but before an appetite has been aroused which is quite as difficult to subdue.

A person, for instance, is induced to smoke a cigar after dinner. The inducement, whatever it may be, constitutes the impression made upon the brain. The persuasion of a friend, the desire to be sociable, or the idea that smoking would be beneficial to the health prompts to the performance of the act, and the cigar is smoked. It is repeated for similar reasons, until at last the act of repetition begins to exercise its effect, and the original incentive is lost sight of in the more powerful one which has taken its place. A habit has been fully formed; an appetite has been created; and neither can be broken without violence to both mind and body. The oft-repeated impression has left its traces somewhere each time, until at last it assumes a local habitation and becomes permanently fixed in the organism, not to be lost except through some more powerful influence acting in a manner similar to the first.

What is true of tobacco is even more true of alcohol, for the effects resulting from this agent are more powerful than those that ensue from the use of tobacco; and hence its influence in causing a habit or arousing an appetite is more difficult of eradication.

Next, in regard to those who drink because they cannot, with their then existing means of control, prevent the indulgence—an indulgence which they know is injurious to them and from which they honestly endeavor to abstain. A great many of these people have the proclivity to the excessive use of alcohol born in them, and, aware of this fact, they sometimes imagine that it is useless for them to try to overcome the fatal inclination. This inclination may come upon them spontaneously, without there being any love for alcohol, either for its taste or for its effects, and act with a force which it appears to them they are powerless to resist. Even in regard to substances which produce no very

marked effects upon the system, a habit may be aroused through this influence of hereditary tendency.

Thus, a gentleman informed me that his grandfather had become accustomed to wake up from sound sleep at twelve o'clock every night and drink a cup of tea, after which he would lie down and sleep quietly till morning. The father of my informant was a posthumous son, and his mother died in childbirth with him. He was English, and at an early age went to India with an uncle. One night, when he was about twenty years of age, he awoke suddenly with an intense desire for a cup of tea. He endeavored to overcome the longing, but finally, being unable to sleep, got up, and, proceeding to an adjoining room, made himself a cup of tea, and then, going back to bed, soon fell asleep. He did not mention the circumstance at that time; in fact, it made no strong impression on his mind; but the next night the awaking, the desire, and the tea-making were repeated. At breakfast the following morning he alluded to the fact that he had twice been obliged to rise in the middle of the night and make himself a cup of tea, and laughingly suggested that perhaps it would be as well for him in future to have the materials in his bedroom. His uncle listened attentively, and, when the recital was finished, said:

"Yes, have everything ready, for you will want your tea every night; your father took it at midnight for over twenty years, and you are like him in everything."

The uncle was right; the midnight tea-drinking became a settled habit. Several years afterward the gentleman returned to England and there married. Of this marriage a son—my informant—was born, and six years subsequently the father died. The boy was sent to school till he was sixteen years old, when he was sent to Amsterdam as a clerk in the counting-house of his mother's brother, a banker of that city. He was kept pretty actively at work, and one night in particular did not get to bed till after twelve o'clock. Just as he was about to lie down the idea struck him that a cup of tea would be a good thing. All the servants had retired; so the only thing to do was to make it himself. He did so, and then went to bed. The next night he again had his tea, and after that took it regularly, waking from sleep punctually for that purpose at twelve o'clock. Up to that time he had never been a tea-drinker, though he had occasionally tasted tea. Writing home to his mother, he informed her that he had taken to the

custom of drinking tea, but had acquired the habit of taking it at a very inconvenient hour—twelve o'clock at night. She replied, telling him that he had come honestly by his liking, for his father and grandfather had had exactly the same habit. Previous to the reception of this letter he had never heard of the peculiarity of his father and grandfather.

Any sensible person, whether physician or layman, will see at once that such a habit as this is not within the range of cure by medicine. And if the comparatively innocent habit of drinking tea at inconvenient hours is not, why the still more imperious habit of drinking alcohol? But, though not curable by medical means, the alcoholic habit is curable, and there are three ways by which it can be overcome.

First, by absolutely stopping the manufacture, importation, and sale of alcoholic liquors.

Second, by putting the person in whom it is desired to stop the habit under such restraint or into such utter seclusion that he cannot by any possibility get liquors.

Third, by instructing him fully in regard to the injurious effects of alcohol upon his system, and, by superior mental influence, so strengthening his will-power as to enable him to resist temptation.

In regard to the first means mentioned, it is probably altogether impossible of accomplishment, even if it is desirable that the presence of alcohol upon the earth should be abolished in order that a comparatively few persons, not by any means the most valuable citizens, should be cured of drunkenness. It is well known that such prohibitory laws as legislatures enact do not essentially interfere with the use of alcohol by the more worthless portion of the community, who will get it at all hazards, while they materially lessen the comfort of those persons who take their glass of wine or mug of beer in all sobriety, and who are benefited by this decent use of stimulants. Nevertheless, it is quite certain that the sale of alcoholic liquors should be regulated by the state, and that much may be done to prevent drunkenness by such wise interference; by requiring a high-license fee and such strict police supervision as will not only insure the purity of liquors, but will prevent their sale by improper persons. The total abolition of alcohol from the earth would, as I have said, be invariably curative of the habit of drunkenness, but it is a thera-

peutical means so utterly beyond the reach of any earthly potentate or power that we may dismiss it from further consideration.

Secondly, in regard to the sequestration of the drunkard. This is entirely within our means of accomplishment, and must form, in the majority of cases, the chief means for the treatment of the habitual drunkard, or the one who drinks spasmodically. The gentlemen who were in the habit of getting up in the night to take tea could have been cured of this habit by such physical restraint, continued for a sufficiently long period to break the force of the power of iteration. We are all conscious of the fact that some one or more of our habits have been broken up when they have become physically impossible of repetition. And this is true not only of habits, but of appetites as well. The longer we abstain from any particular habit, the less powerful becomes the inclination to indulge, and after a period varying according to circumstances, or the organism of the individual, the excitation is no longer experienced.

It must be understood that, after persons have been in the habit for a long period of over-indulgence in the use of alcoholic liquors, the system becomes habituated to their use; and when they are stopped many disagreeable and even painful sensations are experienced. Little by little, however, if abstinence is continued, these become less strongly felt, and they eventually disappear.

There are many ways in which this physical prohibition can be effected. The person against whom it is directed may, in mild cases, be allowed to go at large accompanied by a faithful attendant, or he may, if a high-minded and honorable man, even be trusted to his honor after he has made a promise not to drink. Cases of this kind are not often met with; still they do occur. Or the victim may be subjected to actual imprisonment, either in an inebriate asylum, a hospital, or a jail; the latter, however, proving by far the most effectual, as it is much more difficult to smuggle liquor into a jail than into either of the other places; or the restraint may be accomplished by drugs, such as opium or other narcotics which so stupefy the patient that he is never conscious enough to exercise a habit or gratify an appetite. Of course this is no more curative than would be the production of the same effect by a severe blow on the head, and is, altogether, a method of treatment which, in my opinion, is perfectly unjus-

tifiable. Such treatment cannot be continued sufficiently long to prove of any benefit. In fact, it is never successful, and there is always the risk of making one habit take the place of another.

Still, even after physical restraint has been faithfully persevered in for long periods, many of those who have been subjected to it resume the habit of getting drunk soon after they are set at liberty. They do this simply because they want to. Drunkenness is a mode of enjoyment for them. They either do no, believe it to be injurious or, if so believing, they drink and knowingly take the consequences.

Not long ago a patient said to me: "Doctor, you may lock me up and surround me by guards when I go out, and you may advise me as much as you please, and you may continue this system of treatment for ten years or more; and when you stop it and I pass from under your charge, I will get drunk. I shall do so because I like to get drunk. I am a free citizen of this country, and I have a right to get drunk if I wish to do so."

In this connection it may be stated that many persons continue to drink to excess because they believe they have a moral right to do so if they choose; and they feel that it is an outrage upon their personal liberty to subject them to restraint.

As to moral suasion, the third of our means of cure, it is mainly successful with those unfortunate but intelligent persons who strongly desire to be cured. It is with these that the advice of a physician in whom they have confidence, the encouragement that he is able to give them, and his charity towards their failings which his knowledge of human nature gives him, prove most successful. These are the patients to whose honor we can trust with the most confidence, and these are the ones who are most generally cured.

Now, I am not to be understood as saying that medical treatment is to be altogether neglected. Certain tonics and sedatives are required in the course of treatment, to overcome conditions that may be produced in the system of the habitual drunkard when his customary stimulus has been taken away; but as to the specific influence of the nitrate of strychnia, which has had its day, and the double chloride of gold and sodium, which is now being palmed off on the public as a certain cure for drunkenness, I have only to say that their use in such a connection is most irrational, unscientific, and delusive. Almost every drunkard can

abstain for a time, more or less long, by the mere effort of a very weak will, and actuated by a desire to think that he has got something to cure him. But I venture to say that there is not one single case of a cure by either of these agents, or any other agent, by the unaided power of the drug. Strychnia or gold or almost anything else will, when used in the case of sensible persons who sincerely desire to be cured, and who are imbued with confidence in the physician, prove efficacious. I have cured patients with a daily hypodermic injection of a few drops of water, combined with the influence or mental predominance which I happened to have over them. But that there is any antidotal power in the chloride of gold, or any other drug, is the purest kind of fiction. I have used the chloride of gold hypodermically in my practice for many years, and I have never witnessed a single case in which it abolished the taste for alcoholic liquor. Neither do I believe that there is any such case in existence.

This is all I have to say on the subject, although there is one means of cure not yet sufficiently tried, but of which the therapeutical promise appears to be good; and that is hypnotism. There are cases on record in which it is said to have been effectual, but I have none such within my own experience. I have, however, cured two cases of the opium habit by employing it. Its range of usefulness is, unfortunately, not large, for comparatively few persons are subject to its influence.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, M. D.

DR. CROTHERS:

ANY satisfactory or reliable answer to the question, Is drunkenness curable? must come from a scientific study of the nature and character of drunkenness. Fortunately, recent advances of science have furnished many facts and data by which to determine this question apart from personal opinions and theories.

A very curious chapter of psychological literature could be written on the popular theories of the day concerning drunkenness and its curability. Thus, persons who believe inebriety to be a vice and sin are confident that conversion will cure every one. Many so-called gospel-temperance advocates claim to have cured thousands of inebriates, and assert with great emphasis that

the grace of God, through a change of heart, will make sober men of all such persons in all conditions of life. Another class believe drunkenness to result from weak will-power, with absence of plan and purpose in life, the great remedy of which is the pledge. The old Washingtonian revival, the Father Matthew movement, and the blue- and red-ribbon revival waves are illustrations of the practical application of this theory. The most wonderful success in the cure of drunkards is claimed by the adherents of this method of treatment.

Many persons proclaim that drunkenness is always due to a wilful criminal impulse, which can only be cured by punishment and suffering. They would have laws for more severe punishment, establish the whipping-post, confine drunkards in dungeons, in irons and on bread and water, and, finally, use capital punishment. Curiously, the believers in this theory cite examples of its practical value in the cure of many cases.

It is clear to many people that the prohibition of alcohol will cure drunkenness effectually. Others assert that drunkenness is a mere stomach trouble, and that specific drugs will destroy the appetite; also that, by treating this appetite to excess of spirits in everything used, a permanent repugnance can be created. A large number of cures are said to be made by these methods.

The drug-specific treatment is now quite prominent, but, as in many other matters, the results are subjects of faith rather than of demonstration.

These and other theories are proclaimed from the pulpit and platform, and even in the court-room, and are scattered broadcast in journals, tracts, and books; and yet all competent authorities agree that drunkenness is increasing. Some reasons for this are apparent in the legal method of curing drunkenness. Fines and short imprisonments, supposed to stop all further use of spirits, produce the opposite effect, and intensify all the conditions which impel the drunkard to drink. Statistics show beyond doubt that the station-houses and jails are more dangerous and destructive than the saloons, and that 98 per cent. of all inebriates who are punished for the first time by fine and imprisonment are re-arrested for the same offence continually until death. There is a grim irony in the method of cure that makes recovery more and more impossible, and finally completely destroys the victim. Evidently as long as the drunkard is regarded from the moral side

alone (and judged by the theories urged a thousand years ago in explanation of his condition), his curability will be doubtful and exceptional.

Another very curious chapter might be written on the spasmodic efforts, through parties, societies, and agitations, to rouse the public to use certain curative measures for drunkenness. The literature of these movements is the strangest compound of errors and misconceptions that are repeated without a question or doubt of their reality. Take the established facts concerning alcohol: they could all be put on a single page; and yet over two hundred volumes and pamphlets have been written on this topic, and these do not include all. A dozen different text books are published to teach the action of alcohol to schoolchildren. Hence it is almost impossible from any comparison of theory and practice to form any conclusions as to the actual curability of drunkenness.

The scientific student must begin his inquiries without support from present knowledge, and aside from this mass of opinion and theory. He must approach the subject entirely from the physical side, and seek to ascertain what drunkenness is, its causes and character, and why alcohol or other narcotics are used so excessively, and beyond all limits of reason and self-preservation. When these facts are understood, the question of curability can be answered. The scientific method to be pursued in this study is the same as in all other physical problems. First, gather and tabulate the histories of a large number of inebriates; then make comparative studies of these records, and ascertain what facts, if any, are common to all of them. The history, beginning with the individual, should extend back to his parents and grandparents; giving accurate details of all family diseases and accidents, and diseases which have appeared in different members of the family; also their habits of living and occupation; their successes and failures in life; their character, conduct, surroundings, and longevity. To this add the history of the collateral branches and near relatives up to the present. Then, coming to the individual, record all the facts of his birth and the condition of his parents prior to his birth; his early childhood, diet, diseases, and occupation, and the culture and care received; also all the accidents, diseases, nerve and muscle strains, shocks, and failures, his surroundings, and all the facts of his life up to the onset of

his drink-history; the circumstances attending the first use of spirits and the effect upon him; his habits and mode of living, together with all the circumstances of his diet, condition of life, and its failures and successes; the effects of alcohol and its influence over his daily life, and all the other facts of his history.

While accuracy as to many of these statements may be difficult to secure, certain general principles will appear, which must have been followed or preceded by certain minor facts, either known or unknown. The more exhaustive these facts are, the more accurate the conclusions. From a grouping of a large number of such histories a startling uniformity in the causation, development, and termination appears. Literally the same causes, the same surroundings and conditions, appear in nearly every case. To illustrate, heredity as a causation appears in over 60 per cent. of all inebriates. The parents and grandparents have been continuous or excessive users of spirits, or have been insane or mentally defective, or have been consumptive, or had rheumatism, gout, or some other profound constitutional disease before the birth of the child. These physical states have been transmitted, and burst into activity from exposure to some peculiar exciting cause. In 20 per cent. there will be found the same history of disease and injury preceding the use of spirits. Thus, blows on the head, sunstrokes, railroad accidents, and injuries which have caused stupor or periods of unconsciousness; or profound wasting diseases, from which recovery has followed, and with it the use of spirits, which sooner or later developed into drunkenness; mental shocks from grief and joy or other profound emotional strains, are often followed by intense craving and drunkenness. Ten per cent. will give a clear history of brain- and nerve-exhaustion preceding the inebriety. In 5 per cent. bad sanitary surroundings, bad living and diet, have been the exciting causes; and in a small percentage the causes are obscure and unknown. These are some of the most prominent facts appearing from a comparison of the histories of a large number of cases. Many of the causes are combined in one, such as heredity, bad surroundings, brain-exhaustion, or brain-injury. In some cases old heredities appear in the second generation, or peculiar nerve-injuries that develop into inebriety.

Another fact appears from these histories equally startling, viz., the uniformity of the progress and march of each case. A

certain progressive movement is noted along a uniform line of events that can be anticipated and predicted. Halts, diversions, and apparently retrograde marches may occur, but the large majority of all drunkards begin at a certain point, and march down the same road, and cross the same bridges, and arrive at the same termination. To find where the case started and where it is at present is to find accurate data from which to predict the future with much certainty.

Drunkenness often takes on the form of periodicity, in which the use of spirits occurs at distinct intervals. These drink-storms, like epilepsy, are followed by a free interval of health and sobriety. During this free interval the victims display mental vigor and great resistance to all exciting causes, then suddenly relapse, and use spirits to excess for a fixed time, and recover. Such cases exhibit a strange cycle-like movement, coming and going at exact intervals that are uninfluenced by circumstances or conditions. Some are solitary midnight drinkers; others only drink at certain places and at certain times and seasons. Many curious and fascinating facts that are not understood appear in the history of this class, and suggest a range of causes yet to be studied.

Such are some of the general facts which are found to be uniformly present in most cases, and which indicate beyond question that drunkenness is a disease. The mental degeneration and obscure forms of psychical disturbances, associated with a craving for spirits that dominates every consideration of life, point to a form of insanity in which both the brain and nervous system appear to suffer from paralysis and exhaustion. The use of spirits may cause the paralysis and favor the exhaustion which proceeds from it. Intoxication exhibits in a concentrated form the common types of insanity, mania, melancholia, and dementia in a brief time. The injury from these states must be very great, and the inference that the demand for spirits is often a symptom and not the disease is amply confirmed.

From these and many other facts the curability of drunkenness becomes a question of the application of scientific measures and means to conduct or assist the case back to health again. The condition to treat is that of progressive brain- and nerve-exhaustion, lowered vitality, with damaged and perverted functional activities. The removal of alcohol does not remove the disease, but only one exciting or predisposing cause. Jails isolate the

drunkard and prevent him from procuring spirits, but experience shows that forced abstinence alone always intensifies the drink-impulse and increases the incurable condition. Something more is required. Enthusiastic appeals to the emotional powers and will are not curative, because the emotions and will are diseased ; the higher moral faculties are perverted and cannot act normally. The drunkard has been switched off the main line of healthy life and living upon the side-track of progressive dissolution, the opposite of evolution. The question is, What means and appliances can bring him back to the main line of health ? can the will-power, or prayer, or any specific drugs, or appeals, or threats do it ? are there any agents along the line of the marvellous, or any miracles, that will save the drunkards ?

The laws of dissolution are as fixed and certain as those of evolution, and the change from one to the other must be along the lines of physical laws and forces, that move without a shade or shadow of turning. The curability follows from the application of certain general principles, the first of which is isolation and change of surroundings. The drunkard must go into a quarantine, where all the external conditions of life will antagonize his disorder and assist nature to return to health. In a quarantine station or special asylum the diet, baths, exercise, medical study and care, with all other means, can be applied with military exactness. Each special phase of disease and form of degeneration can be treated, from its particular symptoms, with particular remedies. Nerve- and brain-rest, and restoration of all the organic and functional activities, can be obtained by the use of means under the care of the medical man. Thus the drink-impulse is overcome and dies away with the increasing vigor of the mind and body. Like insanity, drunkenness is cured, not by drugs alone, but by building up the body through all the avenues of nutrition, healthful exercise, regulated mental and physical surroundings, and appropriate drugs. Drunkenness must be recognized as a disease legally, and the victim forced into conditions where he can live along the best sanitary lines of health ; where medical treatment and control can be exact and perfect ; and where physiological and hygienic training in its broadest and best sense can be applied.

The details of the application of these principles will suggest themselves to every one. These principles were sug-

gested for the treatment of drunkenness nearly two thousand years ago, but only recently have they received any special attention. Thirty years ago the first pioneer asylum for the application of them was opened at Binghamton, New York. A furious wave of opposition eventually destroyed it, but the truth which it exemplified was above the superstition and prejudice of the hour. To-day there are over a hundred asylums and hospitals in the world for the treatment of drunkards from the physical side. Notwithstanding the storm of opposition which greets every new advance in science (and which in this case is not over yet), the success of the asylum treatment has opened a new pathway of great promise for the future. Public sentiment still denies the disease of the drunkard, and legislatures refuse to give legal power of control; and asylums for inebriates must go on as private enterprises, opposed by superstition, without proper appliances or experience, and treat only the most incurable cases, who come to them as a last resort and from a forced necessity. The wonder is that any success should follow their crude efforts; and yet the statistics of the largest of these asylums indicate a degree of curability that could not have been anticipated.

The first statistical study was made at Binghamton in 1873. Inquiries were made of the friends of 1,500 patients, who had been treated five years before at the asylum. Of 1,100 replies, 61 and a fraction per cent. were still temperate and well after a period of five years. It was a reasonable inference that if 61 per cent. were still restored after this interval, a large percentage would continue so through their remaining lives. Another study of 2,000 cases was made at Fort Hamilton, N. Y., which revealed the fact that 38 per cent. of these cases remained temperate and sober after an interval of from seven to ten years from the time of treatment. In the returns of 3,000 cases studied at the Washingtonian House, at Boston, Mass., 35 per cent. of all the living persons who had been under treatment from eight to twelve years before were temperate and well.

In many smaller asylums both in this country and Europe, where the number studied were limited to a few hundred or less, and the interval of time since the treatment was from four to eight years, the number reported as free from all use of spirits ranged from 32 to 41 per cent. While these statistical facts are not to be considered as final and conclusive, because they

do not extend over a sufficient length of time from the period of treatment or include a large number of cases, they are full of hopeful possibilities and indications that cannot be ignored. In view of the fact that the asylum cases are largely incurable, and since faults and imperfections in both the building and management of asylums are unavoidable at present, the curability of drunkenness by this means is more certain than in any other way. The same principle obtains as in insanity,—the more recent the case, the more curable ; the more complete and thorough the appliances, the greater the certainty of cure. These estimates of cure are sustained by all accurate observers in both Europe and this country, and have become the starting-point for most enthusiastic work by many pioneers.

It is a reasonable inference that if one in every three can be cured by the present imperfect methods, a much larger proportion will be restored to health by the improvements and better institutions of the future. It is evident that a large number of all criminals, insane, idiots, and defectives come from the ranks of incurable drunkards. If such degenerate cases could only be housed and kept under sanitary control, a visible lessening of these defects would follow. Many other facts sustain the opinion that all drunkards, both recent and chronic, should come under legal control and be put in quarantine asylums until cured, or be retained for a lifetime. The practical workings of such asylums are assured in many ways, as well as the fact of the curability of a large number of cases that are literally made worse by the present blundering efforts to improve them. These scientific methods of curing drunkards may be summarized as follows :

First, legislate for their legal control ; then organize industrial hospitals in the vicinity of all large towns and cities ; tax the spirit traffic to build and maintain such places,—just as all corporations are made responsible for all the accidents and evils which grow out of them ; arrest and commit all drunkards to such hospitals for an indefinite time, depending on the restoration of the patients ; also commit all persons who use spirits to excess and imperil their own lives and the lives of others ; put them under exact military, medical, and hygienic care, where all the conditions and circumstances of life and living can be regulated and controlled ; make them self-supporting as far as it is possible ; and

let this treatment be continued for years if necessary. The recent cases will become cured, and the incurable will be protected from themselves and others, and made both useful and self-supporting. Who can fully estimate the benefits to society, to morals, and to civilization by promptly isolating such persons and keeping them in normal states of living? Who can estimate the relief to the tax-payer by the removal of the perils to both property and life from drunkenness? This is not a theory, but a reality only awaiting practical demonstration when the superstitious opposition of public opinion dies away. The time has come to look at this problem in its true light.

The curability of the inebriate is far more certain than that of the insane. The liberty of both is equally dangerous: one is recognized; the other is seldom restrained until he becomes a criminal. The moment a man becomes a drunkard he forfeits all rights to liberty and becomes a ward of the state, and should be controlled by it. It is dense ignorance that permits any one to destroy his life and property by drink, on the supposition that he is a free moral agent. The inebriate is mentally and physically sick, and needs the same help as the insane; and the question of care is simply one of adequate means and remedies to reach the disease. The few pioneers working along these frontier lines of research, looking beyond the dust and conflict of temperance agitation, are fully confident that not far in the future the drunkard will be recognized and cured, and that the mysteries of the great drink-problem will disappear before the march of scientific truth.

T. D. CROTHERS, M. D.

DR. CARPENTER:

THIS question, which has been often asked and variously answered, like many other physiological and pathological queries, is not yet settled. The reason why it remains open is not difficult to see, since it relates to such a variable quantity as man.

Workmen skilled in the business can judge accurately whether an antiquated dwelling, a dismantled bridge, or a crippled ship may be rendered suitable and safe for occupation, as an experienced gardener may predict with reasonable safety whether a diseased plant will mature to advantage; but questions involving the more complex organism, man, are not determined with the same degree of certitude.

Further than that, when influences affecting man are estimated which of themselves do not tend to lessen the power of self-control, some degree of accuracy may be expected; but when, as in this case, the agent considered acts constantly to the destruction of self-control, who can say, since no two men are precisely alike, whether drunkenness in the abstract is curable or not?

The most we may expect, therefore, is a determination of the probabilities involved from a consideration of the physical conditions incident to this repulsive habit, and from observing actual cases of inebriety.

Some men are born drunkards, some achieve drunkenness, and some have drunkenness thrust upon them. Then, again, the question varies with the conditions of youth, manhood, and old age; while physical and mental strength, occupation, and general habits of life need to be considered.

It seems hardly necessary to mention the obvious fact that drunkenness is but the perversion of a necessary function. The human body, like every other active machine, requires force to perform its various labors, of which food in the liquid form is an important source. From 83 to 85 per cent. of our customary diet is water, the importance of which may be noticed in the fact that water constitutes some 75 per cent. of the blood and nearly three-fifths by weight of the whole body. The evaporation of the fluid portions of blood in all parts of the system is doubtless an important factor in the process of nutrition. When a deficiency of fluid occurs in any part, those signal-stations, the nerves, give notice, and a sensation of thirst arises. If the tissues from which this sensation primarily comes lack any necessary element due to their proper nourishment, this sensation varies accordingly, provided that the nerves conveying the signals are sufficiently accurate in the performance of their work. If the living liquids conveying nourishment contain any special ingredient or property affecting the nerves themselves in a peculiar, unusual, or abnormal way, some correspondingly peculiar sensation is incorporated with the sense of thirst.

In this way morbid cravings are created as the result of the continued use of stimulants and narcotics. No one is thoroughly and truly a drunkard, probably, until these diseased cravings have been established. The tendency to drink spirituous liquors may

exist for a considerable period as a perverted natural function without the formation of these abnormal impulses I once knew a young man who had naturally a dislike to the taste of most strong liquors, and yet who got drunk occasionally because he thought it a dashing and manly thing to do. In spite of difficulties he worked up to his highest ideal, and was successful in attaining it. He became noted as a mixer of fancy drinks, and later on as a professional guzzler. For a considerable period, in this case, it may be noted that drunkenness was not due to any internal abnormal craving, but to the external force of fashion and this young person's exalted idea of manliness.

Another case is that of a young man of a wealthy family with several drunkards in the ancestral line, and yet who drank no beverage stronger than wine, and that sparingly, until after twenty-five years of age. He had a natural liking for alcoholic liquors, of which he was thoroughly aware, and yet from the force of his own will never drank to excess till after the age of twenty-five. For a considerable period thereafter he was not in any proper sense a drunkard, and the desire he possessed to drink was that due to nature, probably, and not to disease.

This case illustrates another important point,—that it is not the desire or craving alone that makes the drunkard, but, in addition to that, loss of self-control—weakening of the will. In this particular case the young man's will, which had been previously strong to resist the natural tendency, was weakened by business reverses which stripped him of his property. He then drifted into the common channel of sottish debauchery. Abnormal craving and weakened power of control do not always go together, therefore, though they usually do. Individuals are not rare who possess special likings, which become at times, through one influence or another, morbid cravings for stimulants, and who yet remain steady, sober citizens for the greater part of their lives through sheer force of will. An eminent example of this class is the late John B. Gough.

The will of an individual may be weakened and drunkenness induced by influences which have no relation to morbid cravings. Any sort of sickness that sufficiently lowers the "nerve," as fever, hemorrhage, or tape-worm ; any loss, as the loss of property, loss of friends, or disappointed affection,—any of these may serve to break

down the will, and sottishness results. Morbid craving, however, while it may arise as a consequence of many and various remote causes, is always due, there is good reason to believe, to one of two immediate physical causes—deficient nutrition or perverted nutrition. Alcohol has the same property of retarding the waste of tissue in the human body as it has for preserving snakes, toads, curious growths, and other specimens in the glass jars of the museum. It is true that eminent medical authorities have cited this fact—that alcohol retards the waste of tissue—in support of its moderate use as a food ; but as it may be seriously doubted whether the health is best promoted by retarding the waste of tissue, this property of alcohol suggests quite a different conclusion. A physical reason why savages take so naturally to rum is that they are usually suffering from hunger ; if not as regards the quantity, certainly as regards the quality, of their food. It is no doubt true, as Maudsley has said, that "a freedom of mental power, an exaltation of the whole nature, mental and bodily," is opened up to the savage by the use of intoxicants, just as the same freedom of mental power induces the civilized man when drunk to believe that he owns the earth. But there is the additional reason in the case of the savage that the rum retards the waste of his poorly-nourished tissues.

Dr. Robert Bird, a surgeon formerly of the East Indian Army, has published four cases, which are certainly most convincing as to the point mentioned, that deficient nutrition is an immediate cause of morbid craving, and that when the defects of nutrition are remedied this unnatural craving ceases. These cases, cited by Dr. M. D. Field in an address before the alumni of Bellevue Hospital, are as follows :

"Case I.—I. H., an infant, while suffering from malarious diarrhœa, showed an abiding desire for gin and brandy. When she could get it, she would drink as much as ten or even twelve ounces a day. This amount made her happy, but never very drunk. It was her chief sustenance for some months, and under its influence the diarrhœa got well. The craving for drink disappeared with the disease. When I last heard of her, she was the sober mother of a family, living with her husband in a village near Newcastle, England.

"Case II.—H. R., a scrofulous boy of two years, while suffering from chronic dysentery, developed an insane appetite for

brandy. When this was first offered to him, he drank it greedily and screamed for more, and for weeks brandy was his cry, his joy, and his support. Ultimately he got rid of his dysentery and drink-craving together.

"CASE III.—E. B. was the wife of a river-steamboat captain. Her husband told me 'she drank like a fish,' and had been drinking so for years. She drank anything she could get, and when ordinary drink was not forthcoming, she would drink eau de Cologne, surreptitiously purchased from Hindoo pedlers. As she also suffered from rheumatism of the womb and copious leucorrhœa, I had her removed to hospital for treatment. Cure of the womb-affection in a great degree cured the drink-craving also, but not quite. Oxide of zinc, as recommended by Marcel, of London, and wild-thyme, as recommended by Salvatori, combined with seclusion in an institution where she acted as sewing-mistress, were required to complete the cure of this. She ultimately returned to her husband, reformed and thoroughly restored, nor did she in the subsequent years relapse, so far as I know.

"CASE IV.—M. W., when I first came to know her, was the mother of eight children. In her last confinement she lost a great deal of blood, and subsequently developed a mad wish for liquor, to the great grief of her husband, a steady mechanic. It turned out on inquiry that she had for years previously been in the habit of starving both herself and her children for purposes of economy. Iron, good food, and change to a more temperate climate in this case cured the anæmia, and drink-craving too."

These cases also indicate to some extent, doubtless, the influence of perverted as well as deficient nutrition. It has been frequently noticed that workmen are especially addicted to drunkenness who are accustomed to pursuing their vocations in badly-ventilated rooms. Gross feeding with lack of exercise may similarly pervert the food-supply and produce morbid craving. People accustomed to liveon a single article of diet, or a class of food deficient in some essential element, would seem to be especially susceptible to the dangers of morbid cravings. They receive the quantity of food without the nourishment, and the effect is much the same as the loss of nervous power by the well-fed. Says Dr. George M. Beard: "When the nervous system loses, through any cause, much of its nervous force, so that it cannot stand up-

right with ease and comfort, it leans on the nearest and most convenient artificial support that is capable of temporarily propping up the enfeebled frame. Anything that gives ease, sedation, oblivion, such as chloral, chloroform, opium, or alcohol, may be resorted to, at first as an incident, and finally as a habit. Such is the philosophy of opium and alcohol inebriety."

Referring the immediate causes of morbid craving for alcoholic stimulant to defective or perverted nutrition, we may enumerate the more general influences inducing these conditions, as:

1. Congenital or hereditary; where the parents have eaten the sour grapes of debauchery, and the children's teeth are set on edge with the taint of a depraved appetite.

2. Excessive mental strain due to overwork, anxiety, or similar cause, inducing not only loss of self-control, as already referred to, but, through the strain on the nerves, morbid cravings for stimulants and sedatives.

3. Diseases or injuries to the bodily organs which directly or indirectly affect the brain and nerves.

4. In the case of the weaker sex, certain peculiar conditions, as shown in menstruation, parturition, and especially the climacteric, not only tend to paralyze the will, but induce at times intense morbid cravings for stimulants.

5. Negative social conditions, such as the lack of friends or family ties, inducing lowness of spirits and a perversion of the fluids and functions of the body.

6. Changes in the brain sometimes due to age.

As all these influences lead to one of the two physical conditions, deficient or perverted nutrition, remedies must evidently have reference both to these ultimate influences and to correcting the bodily conditions.

Perverted nutrition due to alcohol itself is not easily remedied; the yearning demands of the poison being difficult to destroy by medicines. Various antidotes have, however, been suggested, and some are thought highly of in this connection. Nearly five centuries ago the old alchemist Roger Bacon asserted that he had discovered in *aurum potabile*, or tincture of gold, the veritable elixir of life, to drink of which would restore age and decrepitude to youth and beauty. The properties of this wonderful tincture, however, have dissolved away and disappeared, till now the only medical value claimed for any combination of gold is that of

the chloride, which is regarded as a specific for the effects of drunkenness, one physician claiming to have made permanent cures of 95 per cent. of his cases. It is difficult to see how he can claim permanency of cure for so large a percentage unless the patients are all dead. The writer's experience in many cases where he has administered the chloride of gold has not convinced him of its efficacy. Other drugs, extract of gentian, the sulphate and also nitrate of strychnia, bromo-potash, bromidia, etc., have been urged similarly as specifics for drunkenness.

As it is doubtful whether the physical action of any drug taken for a brief period will influence the individual to a temperate, sober course of life for a series of years thereafter, unless the state of his mind and other conditions are all favorable, we must still regard the inquiry as an open question—Is drunkenness curable?

From the reports of an institution for inebriates we note, in connection with some five thousand cases of drunkenness, certain points relating to the general circumstances and conditions of life.

In regard to nationality, while it is true that Europeans are heavier drinkers than Americans, the American is more susceptible to the evil effects of alcohol, and as a rule succumbs sooner to inebriety than the European. We are not to infer from this, of course, that the American drunkard, in order to be cured, needs to change his nationality; though it does indicate the need of considering the susceptible tendency to exaltation of the American temperament and the necessity for a non-stimulating diet and non-exciting treatment for quite a long period in any attempt to cure the average American dipsomaniac of his disease.

As to climate, elevated regions are better suited to the would-be temperate than low levels or sea-coasts.

In regard to marriage, in the institution referred to "there were some 2,100 married and 1,750 single male inebriates, and 400 married female inebriates, and only about 50 single female inebriates"; from which it is but fair to infer that uncongenial marriages lead to inebriety in a greater ratio than solitary singleness. Unmarried males were, however, more frequently subjects for readmission than the married; while the reverse was true in regard to females.

As to age, inebriates may exceptionally, but do not as a rule,

attain to a long life. About one in 400 reaches the age of seventy years.

As to indoor occupations, the greatest number of drunkards were those engaged directly in the liquor business, and next to those painters, and printers next. Of outdoor occupations drivers and teamsters were the greatest in number. The professions ranked, in the order of greatest number of inebriates, as follows : physicians, lawyers, engineers, druggists, journalists, artists, students, reporters, clergymen, actors.

In regard to occupations, the more arduous the calling and the greater its demands upon the physical as well as mental powers, the greater the tendency to inebriety ; from which it is fair to conclude that a necessary condition in any system aiming at a permanent cure is rest for a sufficient period to enable the physical factors of life to readjust themselves on a normal basis. Where any self-regulating apparatus like the human body suffers derangement, occupying considerable time in the process, it would seem but reasonable to suppose that an equally long period at least would be necessary to effect a normal readjustment. According to unquestioned testimony, not only does the drinking-habit derange and poison the tissues, induce morbid craving, and weaken the power of self-control, but it destroys the moral responsibility of its unfortunate victim. He becomes not merely diseased, but insane, and in accord with his temperament exhibits the vagaries, hallucinations, or silly eccentricities of the lunatic.

To attempt to cure the confirmed inebriate by appealing merely to his moral sense as against the morbid craving of a diseased stomach and brain would seem futile. The poor drunkard may appreciate the argument, acknowledge its truthfulness, and yet have no will to enforce it. The best he can do is to place himself in a situation where his physical powers may be restored and where he will be free meanwhile from the social influences inducing him to drink.

I once knew a brilliant young man who had become a drunkard. In one of his sober periods, which were not frequent, he fell in love with a young woman who, for the time at least, reciprocated his affection. He proposed to her and, acting under the advice of friends, she consented to marry him provided he would lead a perfectly sober life for two years. He agreed to this, and engaged himself to work in an institution where absti-

nence from all intoxicants was the law. This plan was successful, and he now is a successful business man in a neighboring city, and is not a drunkard. The most we may expect of the confirmed inebriate in his lucid moment is that he may have sense and will enough remaining to put himself into a condition favorable to his recovery.

ELON N. CARPENTER, M. D.

DR. EDSON:

PROBABLY no subject has interested students of humanity more than that of intemperance. For ages writings against it and remedies for it have been wisely and unwisely spread broadcast. Law-makers have enacted all manner of measures to effect its suppression, and yet to-day it appears as prevalent a vice as ever. Indeed, the adulterations of the various intoxicant beverages have increased their harmful effects, and in more ways than one enhanced their pernicious influence. To determine if inebriety (chronic alcoholism) can be successfully treated, we must thoroughly understand the causes that lead men and women to indulge habitually in strong drink.

In this connection we will first consider the influence of heredity, for it is of paramount importance. The transmissibility of the vice of intemperance from parent to offspring has been noted by nearly all the ancient writers upon the subject, but none, so far as I can ascertain, recognized the importance of this phase of the question. They noticed it merely as a curious fact, just as they noticed an inherited physical characteristic. They failed to see that it determined the difference between a crime and a disease. Magnus Huss was the first writer who recognized alcoholism as a diseased condition. Morrell, taking up the thread where Huss left it, demonstrated the degenerate effect of alcoholism upon the progeny of drunkards. A host of writers might be quoted whose observations cover long periods of time, and prove beyond a doubt that intemperance is transmitted through successive generations. Instances of this are interesting and instructive.

One observer of high standing (Gall) describes the case of a Russian family in which father and son both died early in life from alcoholic excesses, while the only member of the third generation manifested at the age of five years a craving for strong drink.

Another observer (De Bouzareingue) states that he knew a family whose females transmitted the vice from mother to daughter for several generations. The writer has knowledge of a family sprung from an intemperate mother, consisting in three generations of some twenty-seven persons, twelve of whom were addicted to the excessive use of alcoholic liquors and three of whom used opium habitually. Grenier, of France, who made a special study of alcoholism, has shown that weak-minded persons are much predisposed to the abuse of drink, and that, having the hereditary taint, they become inebriates by the same process of development as their progenitors.

A short time ago the Medico-Psychological Society of France offered a prize for the best essay on the "Influence of Heredity on Alcoholism." M. Paul Sollier, resident physician of the hospitals of Paris, was adjudged the successful competitor. In his essay Sollier classifies drunkards as follows: 1st, dipsomaniacs (hereditary drunkards, who are not always intoxicated); 2d, acquired drunkards (non-hereditary), who are always intoxicated; 3d, hereditary drunkards, who are always intoxicated. He shows that to hereditary drunkards alcohol is more deleterious in its effects than to those whose habits are acquired. This he does by a vast number of statistics collated from literature and wide experience. Theoretically, too, he is right, for the offspring of drunkards inherit a feeble, rheumatic temperament; and to such a temperament alcohol is especially harmful. A drunkard not only procreates children who inherit his appetite, but his offspring are also feeble, bodily and mentally. Le Grain, another celebrated student of alcoholism, powerfully sums up his able thesis thus: "If there be any two propositions that we have a right to formulate at the present day, the following are two: 1. Cerebral inferiority—the direct cause of excesses in strong drink—has its origin most frequently in heredity; that is, excessive drinkers are degenerates. 2. Alcoholism is one of the most powerful causes of mental degeneration; that is, the sons of inebriates are degenerates. The relations between alcoholism and mental degeneration are comprised within this terribly vicious circle, which is irrefutably traced out and confirmed by innumerable most eloquent medical observations."

Other influences that predispose to drink are of great importance, comprising, as they do, grave questions of sociology. To

discuss them thoroughly is not within the scope of this short article. I will briefly enumerate those that bear most strongly upon our subject. These arise from bad mental and social conditions, ignorance and vice, lax liquor laws, apathetic public sentiment, vicious or too indulgent early training, a lack of moral rectitude.

Chief among the social conditions that predispose to inebriety is occupation. This may be divided into two distinct classes—1st, occupation that constantly presents temptation to indulgence in drink; 2d, occupation that is so arduous or monotonous that it begets a craving for stimulants. To the first class belong bartenders and others connected with the manufacture and sale of liquor. To the second belong those who are exposed to the inclemency of the weather—cabmen, express agents, etc.; arduous callings—workers in foundries, bakers, etc.; monotonous callings—soldiers, sailors, ranchmen, etc.

The want of occupation is a most potent predisposing cause. Painful or exciting illness often forms the foundation of the habit. Abuse of tobacco may be considered a predisposing cause, as may any agent or influence that depresses the bodily or mental functions. Habits that may arise from a thousand-and-one daily circumstances lead persons into indulgences, small at first, but which are increased in almost geometrical progression. The outrageous adulteration of alcoholic beverages is not only a predisposing and exciting cause, but the essential oils and other deleterious drugs used for this purpose act upon the brain and nervous system with such force as to weaken the already weak intellect, and take from the physician the little help he might otherwise have from his patient in effecting the cure.

I have frequently seen samples of concoctions labelled "Essential Oil of Rum" or "Essential Oil of Whiskey," with directions something as follows: Add the contents of this bottle to so many gallons of crude spirit and so much water; the result will be a barrel of rum, whiskey, or brandy, according to the kind of "essence" used.

The effect of alcohol as a robber of the intellect is enormously enhanced, not alone by adulteration, but also by certain aromatics that are added to popularize special kinds of beverages. Absinthe and vermouth are good illustrations of this. These drugs act as powerful synergists to alcohol in its effect on the organism.

Having roughly stated the predisposing causes of habitual drunkenness, let us see what the effect of the exciting cause is upon the human organism, and we will then be in a position to judge of the effect of treatment. The persistent abuse of alcohol affects the human system in a variety of ways. Changes of structure of various tissues result. These changes, as has already been said, are of a degenerative nature. They are insidious and progressive, sooner or later declaring themselves. The stomach is inflamed so that the peptic glands and their orifices are almost wholly destroyed. The functions of digestion are no longer properly performed. Ulcers frequently form in the stomach tissues. The appetite for food is at first irregular, then lost. Nausea and vomiting are often symptoms. The various glands of the body are affected; the liver especially so, for reasons obvious to a physician. At first this organ is congested and enlarged. Inflammation may affect it in several ways, or its tissue may undergo fatty degeneration, or it may become contracted, giving rise to an appearance on its surface called "hobnailed"; also named "gin-drinker's liver." The larynx undergoes changes that affect the quality of the voice. The rasping, harsh voice of the drunkard is well known. Chronic inflammation affects the bronchial tubes, often resulting in chronic inflammation of the lungs themselves (fibroid phthisis). Fatty degeneration of the entire muscular system occurs, and in this the muscles of the heart are involved, giving rise to the well-known "fatty heart." The blood-vessels undergo a change that renders them brittle and liable to rupture. The blood itself is affected. Degenerative changes occur in it that are little understood as yet by physicians. Suffice it to say that the blood is rendered less alkaline than normally, and that its fluidity is altered. It shows a tendency to exude through the walls of its vessels. The scavengers of the blood, the phagocites, are not so active or so easily produced in the blood of drunkards. The kidneys are affected like the liver. Bright believed—and his views are generally accepted—that the kidney-disease named after him was frequently caused by over-indulgence in drink.

But by far the most important changes wrought by alcohol in the system are those of the brain. The circulation of this organ is at first impaired. The blood-vessels, large and small, are dilated. Often the brittle condition

of the arteries mentioned before supervenes, and small hemorrhages into the brain-coverings are likely to take place. Usually the size of the brain undergoes no change. Sometimes its consistency is greater. It is more dense, harder. In very advanced cases areas of the brain soften. This is due to the advanced derangement of the blood-vessels supplying the softened parts with nourishment. Other changes take place in the brain that are not yet noticed. To these are due the altered perceptive senses. The special senses are affected in a variety of ways. The general sensibility is destroyed. Nervous phenomena manifest themselves. Insomnia is the rule. If sleep is obtained, it is disturbed by distressing dreams. Loss of muscular power may be so complete that palsy or paralysis occurs. Neuralgias are common. The naturally-weak will is still more enfeebled. The sense of shame is lost; this is especially the case in women. Memory fails. Acute attacks of delirium, marked by hallucination and delusion, are frequent. The final termination is death or insanity. The latter may take the form of melancholia, mania, chronic delirium, dementia, or general paresis.

Alcohol is said to prevent bodily waste. It does. But the waste it prevents is natural, normal waste that should take place—the excretion of matters that had better be wasted; in other words, it favors the retention of unwholesome materials that being retained form unhealthy flesh.

The drunkard easily succumbs to acute disease or to the results of bodily violence. Alcohol would seem to be one of nature's most powerful agents to effect in man "the survival of the fittest." Weak moral natures are those most liable to yield to its temptations, and the inherited tastes of the progeny of such are likely to speedily result in their destruction. The sins of the fathers are visited on the children.

Recovery from habitual drunkenness is not the rule; it is the exception. The peculiar mental conditions with which the drunkard starts on his career are so overwhelmingly acted upon by alcohol and the synergistic drugs combined with it that his case is almost hopeless from the first. Preventive measures in the case of drunkenness are worth many pounds of cure. Restrictive liquor laws are first in order of importance. The easier it is for men to obtain drink, the more they will get drunk.

The influence of diet in preventing drunkenness must not be

lost sight of. In England, after an unusually strong temperance movement, it was thought wise and proper in many families to compensate those servants who took the pledge by a small addition to their wages in lieu of the customary "beer-money." It was soon found, however, that the monthly consumption of bread greatly increased in these families, and that the beer was thus twice paid for—first, in money allowance; secondly, in its equivalent in bread.

Those whose arduous occupations predispose to the use of stimulants should be plentifully supplied with nourishing food, or the facilities should be given them to obtain it easily.

Of great importance in the treatment of habitual drunkenness is a change of environment. The patient should be cut off from temptation. The impossibility of effecting a permanent removal of temptation is a powerful factor in rendering a cure hopeless. The periodic cravings of the drunkard it is impossible for a person who has not suffered from them to imagine. We can only estimate their strength by the amount of hardship that a drunkard will undergo to satisfy them. Pledges are worthless. It is said that, in England, of 500,000 persons who took the temperance pledge 350,000 were known to have violated it.

Temporary removal from temptation is easily accomplished by means of the many public and private inebriate asylums. It is admitted that these institutions in the United States are unequalled. Their good work and value cannot be questioned. They are often the means of effecting cures in exceptional cases—such a case, for example, as the following, which came under my own observation, and in which I believe the cure is permanent. It was in the person of a young man of great ability and fine moral perceptions—two conditions that in themselves are exceptional in drunkards. His disease was inherited, which makes the exception still more remarkable. His realization of his condition was unusually acute.

I will close my paper with an alphabetical doggerel I learned from him. I have never seen it printed, and its authorship is unknown to me. It epitomizes the subject so perfectly that I cannot forbear to inflict it on my readers. I frequently found my patient sitting up in bed, the pictures on the walls of his room all reversed, for their subjects seemed to him to be endowed with life

and movement. and annoyed him exceedingly. His eyes would stream with tears as he recited the following :

A stands for Alcohol ; deathlike its grip ;
B for Beginner, who takes just a sip ;
C for Companion who urges him on ;
D for the Demon of drink that is born ;
E for Endeavor he makes to resist.
F stands for Friends, who so loudly insist ;
G for the Guilt that he afterwards feels ;
H for the Horrors that hang at his heels ;
I his Intention to drink not at all.
J stands for Jeering that follows his fall ;
K for his Knowledge that he is a slave.
L stands for the Liquors his appetite craves ;
M for convivial Meetings so gay.
N stands for No that he tries hard to say ;
O for the Orgies that then come to pass.
P stands for Pride that he drowns in his glass ;
Q for the Quarrels that nightly abound.
R stands for Ruin, that hovers around.
S stands for Sights that his vision bedim.
T stands for Trembling that seizes his limbs ;
U for his Usefulness sunk in the slums.
V stands for Vagrant he quickly becomes ;
W for Waning of life that's soon done ;
X for his eXit, regarded by none.
Youth of this nation, such weakness is crime ;
Zealously turn from the tempter in time !

CYRUS EDSON, M. D.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

"OUR DREADFUL AMERICAN MANNERS."

I QUOTE the phrase. The most of us have heard it, and have repelled the implication it contains with more or less vigor, according to the strength of our convictions upon the subject.

"We should like to know," say some impulsive patriots, "whether American manners are not just as good as German or Italian manners, for example. Why, when we were staying at Lucerne one summer we used to witness most shocking exhibitions of bad manners from the German and Italian tourists—yes, and from those of other nations, too."

No doubt you did, my dear patriots; but what has that to do with the matter? Upon this subject we may ask, as an American politician is once said to have remarked upon a very different topic, "What have we to do with abroad?" That there is such a thing as Russian or German ill breeding does not absolve Americans from responsibility for their own manners. We shall never reform ourselves by comparing ourselves with others to their disadvantage.

The presence of bad manners implies the existence of a standard from which divergence has been made. That standard is established by a minority of persons trained to habits of thoughtfulness and usefulness. How small that minority is a very little experience will demonstrate, and we do not always find its members just where we should naturally look for them.

One might suppose that in congressional and legislative halls we should find a high standard of manners constantly preserved, but the honorable gentlemen who fill them have quite other views as to what constitutes their duty to their constituents, unless, indeed, they instruct on the principle of showing what is to be avoided by those who wish to be considered well bred.

It is not so long ago that a large number of Columbia College students broke up a theatrical performance by their outrageous behavior in the theatre. True, they were young men, and it is the fashion to excuse much to youth; but the majority of them came from homes of refinement, and better things might reasonably have been expected of them. If we are not to look for good manners among the men who are trained in the foremost colleges and universities, where are we to look for them?

Perhaps at no time in our natural life have the tokens of external polish been more general than at present. That is, there are a greater number of people who lift the hat in salutation, who have fairly good table manners, who respect the finger-bowl on its merits, and keep the knife in proper subjection to its mate the fork, than ever before; but the native savagery is only par-

tially obscured. Watch the procession of people leaving the dining-room of a summer hotel, each industriously plying his toothpick. Observe the rows of spittoons which are displayed in railway cars, hotel parlors and corridors, steamboat saloons, public halls, and business offices. Watch the well-dressed man with his cigar and the laborer with his pipe. Is the one, with his presumed advantages of training, one whit more regardful of the comfort of persons near him than the other, who has not had these advantages? Note the behavior of the knot of friends who are going on an excursion together. If they are men, they puff their cigars in calm disregard of persons near them on the steamer's deck, and oblige every one within hearing distance to listen to their loud and jovial conversation. If they are women, they talk at the tops of their voices and generally in concert, and involuntary listeners are made conversant with a host of minute details amid which the feminine mind delights to wander. If the party be made up of men and women, there is a still greater confusion of tongues, much good-nature, a great deal of joking carried on in a high key, while the amount of decorum manifested depends upon the social position of the members composing the party. This is a variable quantity, however, and the blue blood is not always an assurance of absolute propriety.

Urban manners are supposed to be superior to rustic ones, but the superiority extends only to superficial externals. It may be safely said that not more than one person in a hundred in a city street shows any consideration for his neighbor. The plain fact is that very few of us care what opinion our neighbor is forming of us. Independence is a good thing, but it soon passes the boundaries of good taste and good feeling and becomes noisy self-assertiveness.

The rule of finest manners ordains that in a public place two or more persons engaged in conversation should not obtrude that conversation upon the ears of disinterested third parties. Because A has met B in the street, it is not needful that C and D should be obliged to listen to what A and B have to say to each other. Nor when Mrs. E meets Mrs. F in the street-car should these two estimable matrons take all the other occupants of the car into their confidence respecting what interests the two friends only. There is no rule of good breeding oftener violated than this. Go where one will, its observance can hardly ever be noted, its violation is almost universal. The woman who calls across the alley to her neighbor leaning from the opposite tenement-house window is no greater a sinner in this respect than the fine lady who discusses with a companion at the entrance of a theatre or a church topics which are of interest only to herself and her friend, but which every one near her is obliged to hear. It is not that they mean to be heard by persons about them; *it is that they do not care.*

"I don't say anything I am ashamed of," says Simplicitas; "anybody is welcome to know what I am taking about."

True, but has the outside world no rights that Simplicitas is bound to respect? Why should Quietas on his way down the street be obliged to listen to all that Simplicitas, just in front of him, is pouring into the ears of his friend? Simplicitas may be quoting from the ante-Nicene fathers, but that is no reason why Quietas should be forced into the unwilling position of listener.

Perhaps Simplicitas may urge that his voice is one that cannot be pitched on a key low enough to be heard only by the person he is addressing. That is a misfortune, to be sure, but if he cannot learn to modulate his voice out

of consideration for others, he must keep silent in public. There is no other course open to him.

It is the custom in some liturgical churches for the congregation to remain in silent prayer for a moment after the benediction. From the point of view of decorum and good breeding there is something to be said for the practice; but surely there can be no legitimate defence urged for the custom which prevails in non-liturgical churches of using the moment of benediction as a season of preparation for leaving. Persons who take this time for putting on their overshoes, getting into their overcoats, or groping for their hats and canes *are distinctly ill bred*, whether they are members of mission churches or worship beneath gorgeous "roofs of plaster painted like an Indian squaw."

People who occupy the middle seats in the rows of chairs in a theatre do not afford the best example possible of their good manners when they oblige their neighbors to rise in order to let them pass backward and forward between the acts of the play. And persons who in order to "avoid the crowd" leave the theatre or concert-room a few moments before the conclusion of the performance, and by the confusion attending their departure spoil the effect of the last scene of the play or the closing number of the concert, are quite as flagrant offenders against the code of good manners.

It is a common complaint of ushers at church weddings that it is very difficult to reserve for the invited guests the seats which have been set aside for them. A mob of well-dressed women intent upon securing good seats press past the ushers, in very many cases, establish themselves comfortably in the reserved seats, and will not be ousted therefrom.

In the railway trains the majority of the passengers seem bent upon retaining in their possession one more seat than they have paid for, even when they see that other persons are thereby obliged to stand.

Everywhere one meets with self-assertion. Sometimes it is aggressive and conscious; sometimes it is passive and unconscious; but always and ever it is based upon the principle that the comfort of the many must be sacrificed to that of the individual. We stand and talk with a friend in the middle of a crowded pavement, and it matters very little if we thereby obstruct the stream of travel; we make our sidewalks and the floors of our public halls filthy with tobacco juice; we smoke in the street, and almost everywhere else, in the presence of non-smokers; we flourish our toothpicks in public; we commit not only these but ten thousand other sins against good manners; and then we are surprised if any one calls us an ill-bred people. Perhaps we are not ill bred when compared with certain other peoples, but we have no business to so compare ourselves. The only standard by which to measure ourselves is that established by the practice of the thoughtful, unselfish minority—a practice which consists in doing nothing to promote individual comfort, pleasure, or convenience that shall interfere with the comfort or well-being (in the broad sense of the term) of those about us.

"Manners," says Emerson, "form the cloak that virtue wears when she goes abroad"; and lest our virtue be taken for other than it is, it becomes us to see that there are no rents or gaping holes in this outer garment of ours.

The plain, unpalatable fact must be stated that, in spite of the presence among us of many persons whose lives are regulated by a spirit of the finest, most thoughtful courtesy, as a people we Americans are noisy, boastful, ag-

gressive, glorying in our "push" and self-assertiveness, and quite content that these most disagreeable features of our national character should obscure our better and nobler qualities which lie beneath.

I am not concerned with the causes which have produced the results complained of. I am speaking of present facts—facts which are not now brought up for notice for the first time, but have received adverse comment before. But the most serious aspect of the matter is the spirit of indifference to reform which is practically manifested by the common belief that we are better bred than the majority of nations. So long as we are satisfied with ourselves there will be no progress.

But we are not a stupid people, and we are still somewhat sensitive to foreign strictures upon our manners and customs. We have been known to resent foreign criticism in past years and then apply ourselves to reform what was criticised.

Let us be as resentful as we will, and abuse to our heart's content the insolent foreigner or the unpatriotic native who says that there are some very weak places in our armor, and then let us confess to ourselves that our armor *is* weak, and take counsel of our better and unselfish selves as to how it may be mended. Then, and not till then, shall we cease to hear of "our dreadful American manners."

O. F. ADAMS.

ELECTRICITY AND LIFE.

IT SEEMS to be a pretty well-established fact that electricity may be made at least a powerful stimulant to the growth of plants. May it not be more than a mere stimulant? May it not be an actual creator of life? Beans, rye, corn, oats, barley, peas, potatoes, sunflowers, clover, and flax have all been experimented upon, in some cases with astonishing results. In one series of experiments the seeds were electrified before they were sown; in another, currents were maintained through the soil in which they were planted; and in still another, through the atmosphere immediately above the plants. In several instances the yield of fruit was enormously above the average, and in all the growth was unusually luxuriant. Further experiments are in progress, and it is not unlikely that science is about to add another to her long series of beneficent triumphs, another refutation to the croaking philosophy of Malthus and his disciples.

The results of the experiments have, furthermore, a suggestive bearing upon the relation between electricity and that inscrutable something which we call life. If they do not prove them the same, they at least bring them nearer together than any phenomena which have preceded them. When, in the healing art, enfeebled vitality is restored, either wholly or in part, by the skilful application of electricity, nothing is positively demonstrated beyond mere healthful stimulation, the mere awakening of life which already lay dormant in the system, such as might possibly have followed the use of other remedial agents. But here it is not morbid restored to normal conditions, not dormant life reawakened to action. It is apparently the actual development of vitality not preëxistent in the perfectly healthy and normal organisms under treatment. Electricity itself appears to be converted to vitality, as elsewhere it is converted to light, heat, and mechanical motion.

Whether life can thus not only be renewed, but actually transfused into the veins, or rather the nerves, of man remains for physiological science to

determine. It has already been shown that a living body is a species of thermo-electric battery, of which the ectoderm and the endoderm are the opposite poles; that the exhilarating effects of a cold plunge, for example, are due simply to the increase of potential from the reduced temperature of the "cold" electrode. But merely setting a battery into operation, or merely increasing its action, is not increasing its inherent voltage, which is what the recent experiments seem to have done for plants.

But do not heat and the active principle of light artificially intensified produce similar effects. The forcing of vegetable growth in hothouses is an old process, not unlike the one in question, both in method and effect. According to the reports given, however, there is a very great difference in the results attained. If this be true, it would seem to indicate more strongly than ever that of all forms of natural force electricity bears the closest relation to that mysterious form of it which we call life.

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

THE VALUE OF VANITY.

VANITY, shared more or less by all mankind, is universally conceded to to be a weakness, if not a defect. In other words, what everybody possesses, and should be conscious of possessing, everybody condemns, often in unsparing terms. But vanity, if not recognized as a virtue, is at least a necessity. No one could live, and, indeed, no one tries to live, without it. It is as essential to individual advancement, to human progress, to civilization, as to the perpetuity of the race.

Really, it is not so much vanity itself which is censured as its manifestation. To have it in full force, and yet to hide it adroitly, is one of the finest of fine secular arts. The sin of this, as of so many worldly things, would appear to consist in discovery. To have in private is venial: to be found out is unpardonable.

But why should we be ashamed of or disavow vanity, when it is our common heritage, and when it is productive of so good results? What we need is that it shall be so regulated that it may bear desirable fruit. The name hurts it: it sounds feeble, and a trifle vulgar. Rechristen it; call it self-love, which is its equivalent, and you lend it a certain importance, if not distinction.

Self-love has a very wide meaning and various interpretations, most of them unfavorable. It is argued that a self-loving man has not, and cannot have, love for anybody else; that he must be completely, repulsively selfish; that the external world is related to him only through his hard and monstrous egotism. But is there any such man, outside of moral theories and the shocking doctrine of total depravity? Men are never half so bad as they are represented, or as we like to believe in our misanthropic moods. Self-love may be low or high, mean or generous, degrading or elevating. All depends on its quality and degree. The self-love that is little, narrow, absorbing, is allied to gross selfishness, and is characteristic of ignoble minds. The self-love that is modest, moderate, reflective, critical, begets self-respect, proper pride, sense of responsibility, and obligation. It inheres in the loftiest, the gentlest, the most conscientious spirits: it is the fertile mother, the world over, of high thoughts and noble deeds.

The spring of all human action, the source of history, may be directly

traced to self-love—to vanity, if you prefer—in some of its protean forms. Without it, life would be stunted; the world would stagnate. What great, glorious, or disinterested action or career is not due to its promptings? The crown of all virtue is to do good for the sake of good. It is the ideal excellence, and has been attributed to angels by mystics and theologians, who considered man incapable of it. But doing good for good's sake must come from a superior kind of vanity. No one could love good or do good unless its contemplation and performance gave him pleasure of a subtile sort—the pleasure that is inseparable from and a part of vanity. It is not in humanity to do habitually what we hate, or what costs us pain. Our lives, if we are entirely sane, must follow the current of our inclinations, and such current is ever in the stream of self-love.

Why, then, should we decry vanity, name it as we may, since it is the cause and promoter of the best that is in us? It may be the cause and promoter, too, of much that is bad, for all weakness is bad; but we should labor to repress the species of vanity which we feel to be weak, as an aid to the development of vanity of the higher kind. By thus substituting one for the other, by a steady process of elimination and accretion, we build up and strengthen what we understand as character.

It is the petty, sordid vanity, commonly supposed to stand for all vanity, which provokes contempt and reproof. A man who talks of what he eats, of what he wears, of the trifles that occupy him, as if they were of consequence, is thus vain. He is deeply interested in such insipidities, because they pertain to his personality, which is momentous to him, however insignificant to others. Such vanity, strictly conceit, is tiresome and repellent, whenever and wherever displayed. Vanity, proper, strikes a loftier key. It is generally defined as a trait that makes us wish the esteem of others; and this definition is usually accepted as correct. Who can hope to gain the esteem of others by boring them about interminable details of emptiness, by suggestions of frivolous egotism? But such esteem is a compensation any of us might seek with care and pains, provided we are not too intent and solicitous therefor. Vanity should never be gratified at the expense of worthy pride. That commandment should always be borne in mind.

Imagine, if you can, a man without vanity, and you have the likeness of a barbarian. Vanity moves and moulds us through every stage of manners and morals, from the first to the last of our development. Through it we adapt ourselves to our associates; we are considerate, courteous, kind; being aware that such treatment is grateful to receive as well as to give. Without vanity we should be no better than boors, and our boorishness would soon make us social outcasts. Vanity yields us inward light and outward grace. It is similar to sympathy in explaining character and teaching charitableness. To a certain extent it enables us to carry out the golden rule, inciting us to do to others as we would wish them to do to us, in major not less than in minor affairs. What is good breeding but vanity turned outward, its principles applied to our neighbors? It creates comradery; it encourages good-fellowship; it cuts the leaves and gilds the edges of the book of life.

What an incentive to conduct, distinction, celebrity it is! It often supplies the place of moral principle. It restrains the vicious, refines the coarse, supports the weak, disarms the malignant. By it the ignorant are made learned, the mean generous, the timid brave. All ambition, even the most laudable, is largely composed of vanity; for it yearns for the applause

of the multitude. Where would have been our great names but for its urgence? History would not have been written: there would have been neither authors to write nor heroes to commemorate.

We are all actors on the stage of the world, though the great mass of us are mere supernumeraries. But even these, though they may never have a speaking-part, may never utter a word, look forward to the time when they shall draw crowds as *Hamlet*, when the alert critics shall fill columns in discussing their *Othello*. This is vanity whispering in their ear and conjuring dreams that will never greet the dawn. But the fancy is a comfort and will sustain them through many a weary day and toilsome night. No matter if it be but vapor. It is as substance while it lasts, and it may last as long as they. Dreams and vapors are often the best part of existence; for though they deceive, they may continue while deception is needed, and may instill a modicum of content. The actors who rise, who play grand personages with loud acclaim, who realize their visions, are haunted by vanity also. But we cease to hear of this after their ascent. It is constantly put forward, and frequently thought, that those who have attained greatness are without vanity. The name is then changed to self-knowledge, self-appreciation, self-esteem; but it is vanity, nevertheless. The public seem determined to regard vanity as something small, belonging to small natures. But it may be big, even majestic; it animates heroes as well as underlings. The great have no need to show their vanity—performance has rendered its showing superfluous—and hence it is presumed to be unborn. While we are actors on the stage of the world, were it not for the footlights, the scenery, the costumes, the audience particularly,—all emblematic of the machinery of self-love,—the drama would be a lost art.

We must be vain to hold faith in ourselves: without such faith motive would be blunted and achievement impossible. We are all prone to overrate ourselves; but such overrating furnishes us with the audacity to attempt and the strength to endure. It is far better to have too much vanity than too little, since our acts almost always fall below it. And vanity in excess carries us, in consequence, further than vanity that is inadequate. We may be ridiculous through manifestation of self-love; but the ridiculousness disappears when execution is undeniable. Instead of telling what we can do, we should do it first. Then others will tell for us. The vainest men are probably the most reserved, as the deepest feeling defies expression. It is our duty, perhaps, to think much of our powers, and to cultivate simultaneously the habit of silence.

Hope and vanity are the phantasmal poles of our being. They both paint pictures that elude the senses and cheat the mind. One is a will-o'-the-wisp; the other, half a falsehood. But they enable us to live in a harsh, barren world; to hide the pains and penalties that destiny ordains. Without their combined aid, might not the planet cease, in time, to be populated?

JUNIUS HENRI BROWNE.

THE IDEAL UNIVERSITY.

THERE is but one possible university. The only possible university, as a thing actually realized, has never been seen upon our planet. This is odd. Where did the name come from? it may be asked. And the answer is, Names come before their time. Names are ambitious things. They are the reaching of the race in hazy vision after things which are instinctively

groped for, and which lie hid for centuries in ways that afterward excite our marvel. There is but one orthodoxy; but who has ever reached it?

This paper will be laughed at if it fail to make out its case; and it may as well be bold. There *is* an oncoming university. It is absolutely simple. It will have the attribute of oneness, and smile at all that have gone before. Its marvel will be that it was so lately born; and Cam and Isis and Tiber, the Seine and the Nile, who thought they had universities on their banks, will be forced to conclude otherwise. Nay, they will admit that the name has worked damage; that claiming orthodoxy has prevented our being orthodox; that building no end of universities has prevented us from having any; just as the law of the sidereal heavens under such a potherer as Tycho Brahe had shut out from us gravitation, when every footfall upon the floor, and every grinding of one's chair upon the carpet, was a clamoring upon our sense for a simple recognition of the attraction of every particle.

Now, what is a university? A university is a college and a bunch of training-schools. Men will smile at such an idea as pretending to be unknown and unapproached among the nations; but as we go on and describe what we intend, let any one say in what part of the globe any such thing is actually found. We will give him a chance for this under three unveilings of the thought that we propose:—

First, the mischief to a college of trying, itself, to be a university; second, the blessing to a college of staying where it is, and diminishing rather than increasing, oftentimes, the number of its professorships; and, third, the novelty that some college will effect by creating the annex to itself of a bunch of training-schools.

I. The mischief of which I speak will appear under these considerations: (1) A man's mind can attend best to a certain number of studies. Multiplying them, after that, can be of no manner of advantage. (2) It is a prime function for a school to pick out for a boy's learning the very princeliest subjects of thought. (3) Our fathers thought they were doing that under certain time-honored curricula. We do not believe that the crowding of professorships has occurred from a doubt of this. It has been a vague idea of progress, some undefined notion of something higher, that has led a college president to stand out on commencement day and tell of forty-two professorships, instead of an original eleven, rather than any well-defined idea of how some score of them were to come in.

I have a college at my door; one of splendid opportunity. It has been under my eye all my life. It has a peerless chance of being the university of the future. It has the geography,—in a circle of sixty miles shutting in the biggest cities and the largest population in America. It has the ethnography,—the deep Scotch-Irish pocket, which it has begun to empty. It has the geology,—in this first rising from the sea, of which the very Indians understood the beauty; where they had their trail north and south for ages, and where the white man followed on its well-drained ridge with his stage route along the seaboard. It has the climate,—unfavorable to being sick; and the temperature,—most favorable to study. It has the philosophy,—at least it thinks it has; and the theology,—at least that which requires the least mending. And yet the inheritors of this seat, with ample lessons to the contrary in the east, are spoiling themselves for a college (I feel sure it is only for a time) by smothering their college itself in the misbuilt lumber of a possible university.

I have no doubt that many an old brain has labored, as mine has, with

the wonder how all these new bearers are to get around the corpse. It used to puzzle old-time dons to get a hand upon us often enough when they were but ten. How now when they are forty? The thing is preposterous. And therefore arithmetic comes to the rescue, and studies begin to be pushed to the wall. This might be well enough (except for waste in the money of the professorship), but, alas for us old-time men! it is our princeliest that have been thrust aside. There has arisen the horror of what is called an "elective system." Let me step right over into the second count, viz.,

II. The blessing of the old-time *régime*.

The mass of men, from one cause or another, are early and late day-laborers. This must be an acknowledged fact. And it must be acknowledged, further, that, except in rare instances, they cannot spend a fortune in years of learning. But there are some that can; and these are the men that will have a college.

A college, therefore, is a school which takes a man destined to the higher crafts (or, through wealth, sadly enough, destined to no craft whatever) and carries him through a liberal training.

A college is of the neuter gender as respects professions. In fact, it is not sexual. There should be a college for men and a college for women. It is the cellar of the coming architecture, and should be levelled up alike, whether the structure upon it is to be a drawing-room life or a manufactory.

Suppose a youth does not like mathematics. *Teach it to him*. He has something defective in that direction.

We never have found a man who could explain the watered meadows of Virginia. A field that lies right can be so side-ditched and flooded as to bear the weight for centuries both of hay-making and grazing-down. Men literally show it no mercy. It is not that it is assured from drouth; for the water is taken off in the summer season. It is not lime water that does it; for the effect is for ages, long after the carbonate supply would become a drug upon the soil. Moreover, freestone rivulets answer just as well. What is it, then? The fact is, nobody knows.

There is a language, now, that is laid on like that water. It is a half-dead language; but, somehow or other, the Peels and Gladstones and Butlers and Bacons of the world sprout out from under it. Put its students outside of a ring, and others, equally first-class, by themselves within, and these last might be hooted at as a handful. Ask Milton where he puts the Greek language, or ask Pitt, and one might be made indignant that the fad of the present day puts into the very rig of our colleges the right of trampling upon Greek after the sophomore year.

It will be understood, therefore, that we are teaching that a college should stay a college. If a college stay a college, it is a grand part of a university. I looked for a professor one day, and found him with fifteen students lecturing, with a French model, on the entrails of a goose. Think of a callow youngling able to choose that as against the scholarship of such a man as Sir Robert Peel!

A university, therefore, is a creation with an academical department or college of some ten time-honored, world-selected, highest-possible, never-to be-changed, classical and scientific disciplines. If you wish to know what they are, open the catalogue of almost any so-called "one-horse college." This is a fine advantage just now that a minor college has over its great competitors.

III. Then, what is the university feature?

(1) It is *not* post-graduate courses. These are but loitering lengths to chill the race of life. They are but congestives of the college. The entrails of the goose, after flattering a boy into loss of such a thing as Greek, flatter a man often into a drowsy year of imagined increase of schooling.

(2) Nor is there the university feature at Oxford or at Yale. There is in part. Yale, where it teaches law, or Harvard, if it teaches medicine, or Princeton, even now partially equipping electricians and civil engineers, ought to have spied long ago the track into a proper university. A university is a clean-cut, solidly-employed academy where boys are advised and insisted on for the very choicest curriculum of study; and then, *with no loss of time*, an immediate wheeling into line for those professional studies that are to end in a youth's practical entrance into his business career.

A convenience to such a university is that it is always, and never, complete. If Princeton should quit throwing its forty-odd professors at the boys, to bury them under the heap of the missiles, and should set its fences back neatly to enclose ten princeliest branches of learning, making ten professors, or twenty professors, or thirty, for the single or double or treble necessity of mechanical division of the class, it would have the first grand necessity of a university, viz., a solid college. Then, each training-school after that would be complete in itself.

There are certain professions followed by the liberally-educated. The list is ever increasing. So must a university increase; though, like a cut worm, each part is vital. Graduates are to get to be farmers or doctors or car-builders. Let there be a school for each profession. Take a man from the commencement stage and prepare him for his business. The forty professors then would not be nearly enough. Let there be a school for every enlightened work. Let each have its staff of teachers and its term of years. A university then would be a great manufacturer of working people,—lawyers, preachers, or professors,—a school of professors for each of the college branches,—a school for Greek professors, for example; a school for metaphysical teachers, by which such a great seat might lay its hand upon the philosophy of the land. Why has not the world had this? A rich quinine-maker might endow a school of manufacturing chemistry, and so the university might grow with every addition of art among men.

Ordinary post-graduateship would be of all things the most undervalued; and every brick in the wall would be looking to that highest culture, the pushing of a man along toward an actual issuance upon the field of his business maintenance by the labor of his life.

JOHN MILLER.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXIX.

OCTOBER, 1891.

CAN WE MAKE IT RAIN?

BY GENERAL ROBERT G. DYRENFORTH AND PROFESSOR SIMON NEWCOMB, LL. D.

WITH the steady movement of our population westward the flood of immigration has ascended the valleys of our western rivers, and is now rapidly spreading out over the vast stretches of unwatered prairie land which comprise the great plains of the western portions of Nebraska, Kansas, the Dakotas, Wyoming, and Montana, the Llano Estacado of Texas, and the arid plateaus of the mountain States and territories.

As civilization pushes its way further into the semi-arid regions, the subject of irrigation and artificial means of procuring a sufficient water-supply grows in importance, and forces itself, whether or no, upon the attention of the country at large; for, as prospers the western farmer, so, to a large degree, prosper both the West and East.

If moderately watered, the great plains and the table-lands of the Cordilleras would afford more valuable lands for the production of cereals and fruits than the entire area of all lands under cultivation in the States east of the Mississippi, while, if droughts in the valley of the Missouri and upper Mississippi could be prevented, the productiveness of those regions would be vastly increased.

In many of the valleys and hilly districts of the West exten-

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

sive systems of irrigating dams and canals have been constructed at an expense of many millions of dollars, by which thousands of miles of land have already been reclaimed from drought and converted into farms and plantations of marvellous productiveness. In the valley of the Pecos River, in New Mexico, a region which was considered but a desert until a few years ago, it is not an uncommon achievement to produce four crops of vegetables in a season by means of the artificial-irrigation systems. Such results are also obtained at many points on the famous Staked Plains, wherever a small garden is put under cultivation, and irrigated by means of bored wells and windmill pumps. For these prairie lands are richly fertilized with deposits of phosphates and vegetable decay, the accumulations of centuries, which have not been washed out by frequent heavy rains, as is the case in other localities.

Irrigation is successfully employed in many valleys and mountainous regions; but no system has yet been devised which could be introduced upon the plains on an extensive scale without very great expense, since there is no opportunity for constructing elevated dams and reservoirs upon the level prairie lands.

If, then, this vast territory, which might be so prolific, is ever to be utilized for anything more than furnishing a meagre subsistence to a few head of cattle to the square mile, some method different from any now in practice must be introduced to provide for a sufficient and regular watering of the land. It has been in view of such facts as these that scientists have at various times advanced the proposition of producing rainfall in times of drought, and in arid regions, by artificial means. Various methods have been suggested; but nearly all have aimed to produce rainfall by the same general means, viz., by mingling currents of air differing considerably in temperature and humidity, and so causing the moisture to be condensed and finally precipitated by the cooling of the warmer current, and the consequent lessening of its capacity for holding moisture in suspension. It is believed that nearly all rainstorms originate in this manner, as is stated by Professor Silliman in his "Principles of Physics," page 656, as follows: "Rain is generally produced by the rapid union of two or more volumes of humid air differing considerably in temperature; the several portions, when mingled, being incapable of absorbing the same amount of moisture that each would retain if

they had not united. If the excess is great, it falls as rain ; if it is slight, it appears as cloud. The production of rain is the result of the law that the capacity of air for moisture decreases in a higher ratio than the temperature."

A large part of the water which falls on this country as rain, watering our crops and feeding our great rivers, comes to us in the great equatorial current, which arises far to the southwest over the Pacific Ocean, from which it receives its great burden of moisture, and, flowing to the northeast, bears it directly over the most arid portions of our country and Mexico. However, as it flows on over these regions uninterrupted and undisturbed, it seldom precipitates its moisture until it meets the polar current, which flows over the Eastern States in a southwesterly direction. This current is invariably much cooler, and whenever it comes in collision with the warm, moisture-laden current from the southwest, clouds begin to form from the condensation, and precipitation of rain generally follows.

If in some way the equatorial current can be deflected into cooler currents while passing over the arid regions of the Southwest and West, rain should follow almost as surely as in any other locality. The problem seems to resolve itself into the question, "Can this be done, and if so, how most economically ?"

As long ago as the time of Plutarch it was "a matter of current observation that unusually heavy rains fall after great battles," and it is not impossible, according to the theory of the commingling of air currents, that such rains might have been produced by the great battles of ancient times. Let ten thousand Greeks march into battle chanting their "pæans" and shouting their "allallas," beating time meanwhile on their shields, while a hundred thousand Persians are advancing against them, continually shouting their terrible battle-cries ; then let the great armies rush together with the tumult of clashing swords and shields, the fierce shouting of the multitudes, the hoarse death-cries and shouts of victory, and surely the sound waves rising from such a din will literally shake the heavens, and are capable of producing no insignificant effect among the volatile currents of the upper air. Moreover, the heat generated from the struggling masses and the moisture evaporated from their perspiration would exercise a decided influence in disturbing the equilibrium of the atmospheric conditions.

In 1837, Professor Espy, at that time a well-known scientist, proposed a method of compelling nature to loose the moisture which she holds suspended aloft. His plan was to kindle great fires which would produce a powerful upward current of hot air, and this, "rising to a great height, where, owing to the diminished pressure, it would expand, by the expansion would be cooled, thereby condensing and eventually precipitating its moisture."

The Australian Government proposed in 1884 to make a test of Espy's theory; but when Mr. H. C. Russell, the government astronomer of New South Wales, demonstrated that it would require 9,000,000 tons of coal burned daily to increase by 66 per cent. the rainfall at Sidney, where the average humidity is 73, the project was forthwith abandoned.

Long before Espy's time, the facts had already been noticed that heavy artillery-firing was frequently followed by rain. Napoleon was the first man who is reported to have noted this phenomenon, and he took advantage of its regular occurrence in ordering the manœuvres of his troops.

Later, during the Franco-Prussian War, which opened in the summer of 1870, the fact that rain fell after battles was again brought to notice and widely discussed by European scientists. A letter published in the New York *Evening Post* of October 5, 1870, from which the following extract is taken, shows that much attention had been given to the subject on the other side of the Atlantic. The letter is dated Frankfort-on-the-Main, September 14, 1870.

"Since the commencement of actual hostilities between Germany and France—that is, from about the first week in August to the present time—we have had in this part of Germany scarcely a day without rain, generally continuous, and often accompanied with thunder-storms. This phenomenon has called the attention of the German press to the subject, and some valuable historical facts connected therewith have been brought to light; and there appears to be little doubt, judging from the data on hand, that many storms and rains which we have had in Germany for the past six weeks—a most unusual thing at this season here—have been brought on by the cannonading and firing of small arms in Alsace and Lorraine."

During our late Civil War the same phenomenon repeatedly occurred, and came to be one of the factors in the case to be considered by a general when planning his movements on the eve of an engagement.

In 1870, contemporaneously with the publications concerning

the rains in France and Germany, Mr. Edward Powers, of Delavan, Wis., a civil engineer of wide experience and observation, published a collection of most interesting statistics concerning the sequence of rainstorms after battles, in a volume entitled "War and the Weather." Mr. Powers had been convinced early in the Civil War not only that the concussion of heavy cannon-firing produced rain, but that such a result might be effected at any time without unreasonable expense, considering the value of rain in times of drought.

From the statistics published in Mr. Powers's book, it is found that heavy rains followed almost every engagement of any importance during the Civil War, and, so far as can be ascertained, the same phenomenon was common during the Mexican War upon the arid cactus plains of that country.

A notable instance of its occurrence during the Mexican War was at the battle of Buena Vista, fought on the 22d and 23d days of February, 1847, in the midst of the dry season in that region. The facts, as they occurred on the second day of that battle, as related by Brevet Major-General H. W. Benham, of the United States Engineers, are as follows:

Between 8 and 10 A.M. the artillery was engaged in heavy firing, and between 11 and 12 o'clock a "most violent rain" fell. In the afternoon the cannonading was resumed, and in about two hours after it ceased "another violent shower of rain fell." "And what I consider the *satisfactory proof*," says General Benham, "that this was caused by the shocks to the atmosphere produced by the cannon-firing, is that no rain had fallen in that vicinity for many months previously—I was told six or eight months—and none fell, *as I know* was the case, for three or four months after the battle, as I continued at that position."

The battles of Palo Alto, the siege of Monterey, Contreras, Churubusco, Molino del Rey, and Chapultepec were all fought during the dry season, which in Mexico is very severe, and each of these battles was followed by heavy rains. In his little book, "War and the Weather," Mr. Powers mentions 198 battles of the Civil War, including every battle of importance so far as the writer of this article has discovered, which were immediately followed by rain, as he has definitely ascertained. These storms were generally heavy, but varied somewhat in proportion to the magnitude of the engagements.

One or two extracts from letters received by Mr. Powers from army officers concerning the subject of "War and the Weather" may be of interest as showing the opinion which was held on the subject by those who had the best of reasons to remember the rains, which often served to render their route of march an unfathomable quagmire, or chilled them as they lay in bivouac after an exhausting day of fighting, or possibly on the field of battle among the wounded.

STATE OF MAINE, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
AUGUSTA, December 12, 1870.

MY DEAR SIR: My Adjutant-General has sent me your letter referring to the effect of heavy firing on the atmosphere leading to storms and rain. It is a most interesting matter. The *fact* of such sequences (if they may be called so without begging the question) I have often noticed. Certainly a heavy storm of rain occurred after the great battles of Antietam, Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg, the Wilderness, Spottsylvania, Bethesda Church (Cold Harbor), Petersburg, Five Forks, etc.; and often, I well remember, in what we called small engagements (though they would be called battles in Europe), such as the fight on the "Quaker Road," March 29, 1865, for a late instance, in which there was a sharp, concentrated fire of infantry and artillery for a couple of hours, a very heavy rain would surely follow. This fact was well noticed, and is well remembered by many a poor fellow who, like myself, has been left lying, desperately wounded, after such engagements—for these rains are balm to the fever and anguish of the poor body that is promoted to the list of "casualties." I am sure that you will find my testimony confirmed by the recollections of every soldier.

(*Governor*) JOSHUA L. CHAMBERLAIN,
Late Brev. Maj.-Gen. Commanding 1st Div., 5th Corps.

BLOOMINGTON, ILL., December 13, 1870.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your favor of the 10th, not only has it been my experience that rain follows soon after every heavy cannonading, but that this was very generally conceded and understood in the army, and acted upon by the soldiers in preparing for it after every battle. I remember, particularly, that in the garrison at Lexington, Mo., when water could not be had, it was urged by myself and other officers encouraging the men to hold out for a few hours, and that the cannonading would bring rain to quench their thirst; and it did bring rain, but it found us without means to catch it in sufficient quantities. There are large numbers of soldiers in your city who will remember this circumstance and the wringing of their blankets to get water.

. . . . . .

The inauguration of Governor Hahn at New Orleans was accompanied by cannonading and the noise of musical instruments and anvils, infantry firing, etc., and was soon followed by very heavy rain. When the rebel ram ran by the city, the cannonading, only for a few minutes, was followed by rain. The passage of the forts at Mobile Bay, the bombardment of Fort Gaines, afterwards of Fort Morgan; again of Spanish Fort and Blakely; the landing of our troops at Pascagoula and firing of a few shots with field-pieces on the shore; the battle of Sterling Farm, and the fighting at Atchafalaya River, were followed in a few hours by heavy rains.

I was with the first troops that passed down the river (Herron's Division, Thirteenth Army Corps), after the surrender of Vicksburg, to Port Hudson. We found it very muddy there (July), and also at Yazoo City, when taken by our troops, July 12, 1863. Everybody remembers that there was no difficulty in keeping *moist* at Vicksburg.

. . . . . .

Soon after we crossed the Boston Mountains (Arkansas) we found a light breeze blowing against the mountains from the opposite side. We had some artillery firing—say thirty or forty rounds—near Lee's Creek, early in the morning, with a clear sky. Here I remember that it was urged by some of our officers that artillery should not be used on the small number of the enemy's cavalry that were in front of us, for the reason that *it would bring on rain*, and thereby retard us in pursuit of the enemy. We got the rain in less than two hours. After the firing after the capture of Van Buren also we got rain in a few hours.

. . . . . .

It is possible that I know of an instance where there was heavy firing that was not followed by rain, and that the matter may have escaped my notice.

There are other instances where I know it did occur, but deem it unnecessary to cite them, as I have given you the cases of most importance, and which attracted my attention.

. . . . . .

Truly yours,

(*General*) J. McNULTA.

HIRAM, O., Oct. 28, 1870.

DEAR SIR: In answer to yours of the 22d, I have to say that, while I did not take such observations as a scientific experiment requires, I did observe the frequent occurrence of heavy showers very soon after the battles in our late war. It was a matter much talked of in the army, and there was a general impression that the atmospheric disturbances produced by heavy cannonading hastened or created showers. I remember that heavy showers followed after the battles of Shiloh, Stone River, Shelbyville, and Chickamauga. But while these coincidences are curious and interesting, they are chiefly valuable from the fact that they challenge the attention of scientific men, and may lead to a discovery of the causes which will prove valuable to our knowledge of meteorology.

Very truly yours,

(*General*) J. A. GARFIELD.

The occurrences of the phenomenon of rain after battles were far too regular to be explained as simply coincidences, and, taken with the similar occurrences during the Mexican War and those in other foreign countries, constitute almost unquestionable proof of Mr. Powers's theory that rain can be and is produced by the concussions of cannonading.

Believing that the subject of artificial rainfall offered the possibilities of immense benefit to mankind, Mr. Powers purposed to interest the public in the matter sufficiently to obtain an

investigation by the government. And to secure this end he spent a large part of his time and income for over twenty years, influenced only by motives of philanthropy and expecting no personal benefits, as may be seen from the following extract from his book published in 1870: "The art of regulating the weather to some extent, if such an art should ever be acquired, is not one on which a patent could ever be obtained, nor would the business be one in which a monopoly could ever be exercised by an individual. . . . The experiments, when made, as eventually they surely will be, should be made at the public expense, for it is the public who would be benefited in the event of their success."

As early as 1874 a number of public men, including General William T. Sherman, General James A. Garfield, General John A. Logan, the Hon. C. B. Farwell, and others, became greatly interested in the project of producing rain by cannon-firing; but the expense which it was estimated would be entailed by the first experiments was so great that Congress took no action in the matter. The following estimate of the cost of the first two experiments was made by Mr. Powers, who proposed that two hundred siege-guns, which lie idle in the United States arsenal at Rock Island, Ill., be taken to a suitable locality in the West, and one hundred rounds be fired from them in each operation:

ESTIMATE.

Mounting 200 siege-guns, at $10 each	$2,000
Railway transportation for same, at $40 each	8,000
40,000 blank cartridges, at $2.50 each	100,000
50 tons of hay for wadding, at $12 per ton	600
10,000 electric primers, at $150 per M	1,500
Electric batteries and insulated wire	500
Services of 10 men, 26 days, at $2.50 per day	650
Services of 600 men, 26 days, at $1.50 per day	23,400
Rent of ground for experiments	250
Return transportation of guns to arsenal	8,000
Dismounting and putting guns away at arsenal	2,000
	$146,900
Add 10 per cent. for contingencies	14,690
Total	$161,590
Estimated cost of each experiment	80,795

Of course, if the Department of Agriculture had a regular system of properly equipped stations established throughout the West, the cost of an operation would be greatly diminished, but even then a good rain produced according to Mr. Powers's plan would cost not less than $20,000.

In 1880 General Daniel Ruggles, a resident of Fredericksburg, Va., suggested that, instead of the use of cannon on the ground, the firing of explosives raised high into the upper air strata

by means of balloons be employed. General Ruggles obtained a patent upon this plan, although a description of the same scheme had been published throughout the country several years before, being copied from a New Zealand newspaper, the Mimmora *Star*, in which the following item appeared in the fall of 1876: "Ferdinand Hatermann has been promulgating a new scheme in Horsham for producing rain. He asks that the district join in constructing a number of balloons seven feet in diameter. He proposes to fill these with sufficient gas to carry them into the regions of the rainy clouds, and in each of the balloons a canister of powder. When sufficiently high in the air, he would light them by means of fuse, and the explosion, say of a score of charges going off at once in the midst of the rainclouds, would, he thinks, break them. Whether anything more than smoke would result remains to be proved."

By this plan of raising the explosives used and discharging them among the currents which it is desired to affect, great economy of force is obtained, and the expense of producing the effect which a great battle would produce upon the upper-air currents is very much diminished.

In 1890 the Hon. C. B. Farwell and others who were interested in the subject brought the matter before Congress and obtained an appropriation of $2,000 for use by the Department of Agriculture in investigating the possibilities of the artificial production of rainfall, and the last Congress added $7,000 to this amount for a series of practical experiments. While the matter was before Congress, Senator C. B. Farwell, Secretary of Agriculture J. M. Rusk, and others interested, consulted, concerning the best methods and materials to be employed, with Dr. Claud O. O. Rosell, a chemist of the Patent Office, and the writer, who proposed that, instead of weighting down the balloons employed with a load of dynamite or other explosives, the balloons themselves be inflated with a highly explosive gas, such as a composition of hydrogen in two parts and oxygen one part, which mixture produces one of the most violent explosives known to science, and by employing which smaller balloons can be used, saving largely on the expense of apparatus and also on the cost of the explosives.

Later the writer consented to a request from the friends of the project that he take personal charge of the investigations and experiments, and was appointed a special agent of the Department

of Agriculture for that purpose. Several months were spent in preliminary investigations of the novel subject, and in planning and constructing apparatus, devising methods of operation, and gathering the requisite materials.

On the fifth day of August our party arrived at Midland, Texas, a small station on the Texas and Pacific Railway, situated on the Llano Estacado, or Staked Plains, in a region which had been suffering from a severe drought of several months' duration, and a lack of good rains for several years. A drive of twenty-five miles over the dry prairie, bearing little vegetation but scattered clumps of grass and low mesquite bushes, with here and there a cactus, brought us to the "C" Ranch, where, by the invitation of the owner, Mr. Nelson Morris, of Chicago, the first series of experiments were to be performed. The ranch is a typical Texan ranch of some 300,000 acres, supporting about 15,000 cattle and employing twenty cowboys. Our party, which included Dr. Claude Rosell, Mr. Edward Powers, Professor George E. Curtis, of the Smithsonian Institution, Mr. John T. Ellis, of Oberlin College, and five other specialists and assistants, was very comfortably quartered at the ranch-house, and every facility was afforded which the ranch possessed for carrying on our work. Nevertheless, a number of very serious difficulties and obstacles were encountered, some of which could not be easily surmounted. Chief among these may be mentioned, first, the remoteness of the ranch from any point where necessary supplies could be obtained; second, the very heavy winds which blow over the plains of western Texas almost constantly at a velocity of eighteen to twenty-five miles per hour, and render the manipulation of balloons a task of great difficulty; third, the strongly alkali drinking water obtained from the wells of the Staked Plains, which placed nearly every member of the expedition on the sick-list at various times, in spite of the fact that all the drinking water was treated with acids to precipitate the alkali or counteract its effect.

However, in spite of these difficulties a series of experiments were performed which, if they were not on quite so extensive a scale as will be employed in a few weeks in a locality where the conditions are less adverse, yet yielded results that were as interesting and valuable as could be expected from the first experiments under any conditions.

Our party is now temporarily scattered, and the specialists

who had charge of the investigations in the different lines have not yet had time to send in their various reports, so that it is not possible at this early date to make a report which will be of much scientific value; but a simple description of the operations and statement of the results can be given, which will be of much interest to the general reader.

We began operations with the following apparatus and materials: Sixty-eight explosive balloons 10 and 12 feet in diameter, having a capacity of 525 and 940 cubic feet each, respectively; three large balloons for making ascensions; 20,000 pounds of iron borings and 16,000 pounds of sulphuric acid, together with generators and fittings for manufacturing 50,000 cubic feet of hydrogen gas; 2,500 pounds of powdered chlorate of potash; 600 pounds of binoxide of manganese, with fifty retorts and suitable furnaces and fittings for generating 12,000 cubic feet of oxygen gas.

Material for making 100 strong cloth-covered kites was also brought from the East, as well as the ingredients for manufacturing several thousand pounds of rackarock powder and other high explosives. The party was also well supplied with electrical and meteorological instruments and apparatus.

The plan of operation was somewhat as follows: Three lines were to be formed, each some two miles in length, and placed about one-half mile apart. The first line to the windward was to consist of a large number of ground batteries, where heavy charges of dynamite and rackarock powder would be fired at frequent intervals. The next line to the rear was to consist of a number of kites flown to a considerable height by electric wires, bearing dynamite cartridges suspended from them, to be fired high in the air. The third and main line was to consist of explosive balloons which would produce terrific "air-quakes" at intervals of one to two hours throughout the day or during the continuance of the operation. In actual practice at the "C" Ranch, the first line of explosives was operated as proposed, and on days when the other lines were not in operation explosions were made along this line to keep the weather in an unsettled state. The kites were found to be very difficult of operation in the prevailing high winds, which were constantly breaking the sticks of the kites or parting the electric wires by which they were flown. This line was therefore not operated to the extent pro-

posed. The balloon line was carried out as planned, though the explosions were separated by somewhat greater intervals than were at first intended. The purpose was to imitate the effects of a great battle as nearly as possible, and in this I consider that we succeeded admirably.

The first operation was made on August 9. At this time the balloon apparatus had not been set up, and only the first line of ground explosions was brought into action. The ground batteries were operated for about an hour, beginning at 5 P.M. August 9, and reopened again for a shorter time at about 7 P.M. The weather was clear on the 9th, and the barometer stood at its normal height at 7 P.M. At noon of the 10th clouds began to gather directly over the ranch, and during the afternoon and the evening a very heavy rain fell,—nearly two inches,—transforming the roadways into rushing torrents and every hollow of the prairie into a small lake.

The next important operation was performed on August 18; the explosions having been begun on the evening previous, a large quantity of oxyhydrogen gas was used in the balloon explosions, while the ground batteries were kept in almost constant action for twelve hours. The morning had dawned clear and beautiful, and neither the appearance of the atmosphere nor the readings of the instruments gave any indication of aught but the fairest weather. This state of the weather continued until late in the afternoon, when heavy clouds gathered and *formed* in the south and west, and at 5 P.M. the operators of the ground batteries, which had kept up their roar until that time, were forced to run for shelter through a drenching rain, which fell in torrents for two and a half hours over the entire southern and eastern portion of Andrews County and most of Midland County and those to the south and west of it.

Late in the evening the writer drove in to Midland Station, a distance of 25 miles, and it is safe to say that six or eight miles of the road traversed was flooded under four to forty inches of water.

The final operation of this series of experiments was begun at 11 A.M. on the 25th day of August. At 3:30 P.M. of that day the barometric curve indicated a pressure of 26.93 inches, which is slightly below the normal for that hour at this elevation and locality, where the barometer generally reads "very dry." The wet- and dry-bulb psychrometer indicated a relative humidity of only 16, with the dew-point at 42 degrees.

The wind blew from the southeast (the usual direction) at a velocity of 18.8 miles per hour. The sky was clear, except for a few very light, scattered cumulus clouds, which were estimated, by the movements of the balloons, to be at a height of more than two and one-half miles.

Seven balloons, mostly of the large size, were sent up in this operation. Two 10-foot balloons were exploded by means of electric cable at a height of 1,000 feet, but the explosions of the larger balloons were too terrific to be risked at so close a proximity, and they were therefore fitted with fuses timed for two to six minutes and allowed to attain altitudes of from one to three miles before exploding.

The manner of operating the balloons was to fill them first to one-third their capacity by attaching them by pipes to a number of retorts containing chlorate of potash and a small quantity of binoxide of manganese. When these retorts were passed through the flames of gasoline furnaces set up in a large adobe workshop, the potash, being decomposed by the heat, gave off oxygen very rapidly. The balloon was then attached to the hydrogen generators and the inflation was completed with hydrogen. The hydrogen apparatus consists of three large tanks half full of water, with half a ton of iron borings in the bottom, into which sulphuric acid is slowly decanted. The acid rapidly decomposes the water into its gaseous elements and the iron takes up the oxygen, leaving the hydrogen free to pass through a wash-barrel into the balloon.

While the balloons were being filled and exploded a tremendous "cannonading" was in progress all along the ground batteries, and late into the night this firing was continued along a line a mile and a half in length.

At 11 P.M. the firing ceased, and our weary party immediately retired for the night. At 3 A.M., however, the heavy rolling of thunder disturbed the sleepers, and, looking out to the west and north, heavy banks of cloud were seen advancing, almost constantly lighted by most brilliant lightning. An hour later the rain began to fall in torrents on the ranch, and did not cease till 8 A.M. The northern portions of this county received the most thorough watering they have had for the past three years, and the reports from incoming cowboys indicate that the storm extended over many hundreds of square miles.

Besides these three heavy storms which occurred after the principal operations, not less than nine showers of much less importance fell during the sixteen days of our experiments; a most extraordinary occurrence in this locality, and especially at this season of the year. That these results were not produced at an excessive expense of material may be seen from the fact that in the entire series of experiments only two tons of iron, one ton of acid, one-fourth ton of potash and manganese, and one ton of rackarock powder and other explosives were consumed, none of which are expensive materials.

In the opinion of the writer the experiments clearly demonstrate—

First, That the concussions from explosions exert a marked and practical effect upon the atmospheric conditions in producing or occasioning rainfall, probably by disturbing the upper currents.

Second, That when the atmosphere is in a "threatening" condition—which is frequently the case in most arid regions without any rain resulting—rain can be caused to fall almost immediately by jarring together the particles of moisture which hang in suspension in the air. This result was repeatedly effected during our operations, the drops sometimes commencing to fall within twelve seconds from the moment of the initial explosion.

It also seems probable to the writer that the immense amount of frictional electricity generated by the concussions and the mingling of opposing currents of air may have considerable influence in the formation of storm-centres by producing a polarized condition of the earth and air, and so creating a magnetic field which may assist in gathering and so condensing the moisture of the surrounding atmosphere.

Altogether, considering the great difficulties under which we labored, the results of our first experiments have been exceedingly gratifying and encouraging to the advocates of the theory that rain can be produced at will by artificial means, and the further tests of the theory which will soon be made at El Paso, Texas, will be watched with great interest.

ROBERT G. DYRENFORTH.

TO THE uncritical observer the possible achievements of invention and discovery seem boundless. Half a century ago no idea could have appeared more visionary than that of holding

communication in a few seconds of time with our fellows in Australia, or having a talk going on *viva voce* between a man in Washington and another in Boston. The actual attainment of these results has naturally given rise to the belief that the word "impossible" has disappeared from our vocabulary. To every demonstration that a result cannot be reached the answer is, Did not one Lardner, some sixty years ago, demonstrate that a steamship could not cross the Atlantic? If we say that for every actual discovery there are a thousand visionary projects, we are told that, after all, any given project may be the one out of the thousand.

In a certain way these hopeful anticipations are justified. We cannot set any limit either to the discovery of new laws of nature or to the ingenious combination of devices to attain results which now look impossible. The science of to-day suggests a boundless field of possibilities. It demonstrates that the heat which the sun radiates upon the earth in a single day would suffice to drive all the steamships now on the ocean and run all the machinery on the land for a thousand years. The only difficulty is how to concentrate and utilize this wasted energy. From the standpoint of exact science aërial navigation is a very simple matter. We have only to find the proper combination of such elements as weight, power, and mechanical force. Whenever Mr. Maxim can make an engine strong and light enough, and sails large, strong, and light enough, and devise the machinery required to connect the sails and the engine, he will fly. Science has nothing but encouraging words for his project, so far as general principles are concerned.

Such being the case, I am not going to maintain that we can never make it rain.

But I do maintain two propositions. If we are ever going to make it rain, or produce any other result hitherto unattainable, we must employ adequate means. And if any proposed means or agency is already familiar to science, we may be able to decide beforehand whether it is adequate. Let us grant that out of a thousand seemingly visionary projects one is really sound. Must we try the entire thousand to find the one? By no means. The chances are that nine hundred of them will involve no agency that is not already fully understood, and may, therefore, be set aside without even being tried. To this class belongs the project of producing rain by sound. As I write, the daily journals

are announcing the brilliant success of experiments in this direction ; yet I unhesitatingly maintain that sound cannot make rain, and propose to adduce all necessary proof of my thesis. The nature of sound is fully understood, and so are the conditions under which the aqueous vapor in the atmosphere may be condensed. Let us see how the case stands.

A room of average size, at ordinary temperature and under usual conditions, contains about a quart of water in the form of invisible vapor. The whole atmosphere is impregnated with vapor in about the same proportion. We must, however, distinguish between this invisible vapor and the clouds or other visible masses to which the same term is often applied. The distinction may be very clearly seen by watching the steam coming from the spout of a boiling kettle. Immediately at the spout the escaping steam is transparent and invisible ; an inch or two away a white cloud is formed, which we commonly call steam, and which is seen belching out to a distance of one or more feet, and perhaps filling a considerable space around the kettle ; at a still greater distance this cloud gradually disappears. Properly speaking, the visible cloud is not vapor or steam at all, but minute particles or drops of water in a liquid state. The transparent vapor at the mouth of the kettle is the true vapor of water, which is condensed into liquid drops by cooling ; but after being diffused through the air these drops evaporate and again become true vapor. Clouds, then, are not formed of true vapor, but consist of impalpable particles of liquid water floating or suspended in the air.

But we all know that clouds do not always fall as rain. In order that rain may fall the impalpable particles of water which form the cloud must collect into sensible drops large enough to fall to the earth. Two steps are therefore necessary to the formation of rain : the transparent aqueous vapor in the air must be condensed into clouds, and the material of the clouds must agglomerate into raindrops.

No physical fact is better established than that, under the conditions which prevail in the atmosphere, the aqueous vapor of the air cannot be condensed into clouds except by cooling. It is true that in our laboratories it can be condensed by compression. But, for reasons which I need not explain, condensation by compression cannot take place in the air. The cooling which results in the formation of clouds and rain may come in two ways.

Rains which last for several hours or days are generally produced by the intermixture of currents of air of different temperatures. A current of cold air meeting a current of warm, moist air in its course may condense a considerable portion of the moisture into clouds and rain, and this condensation will go on as long as the currents continue to meet. In a hot spring day a mass of air which has been warmed by the sun, and moistened by evaporation near the surface of the earth, may rise up and cool by expansion to near the freezing-point. The resulting condensation of the moisture may then produce a shower or thunder-squall. But the formation of clouds in a clear sky without motion of the air or change in the temperature of the vapor is simply impossible. We know by abundant experiments that a mass of true aqueous vapor will never condense into clouds or drops so long as its temperature and the pressure of the air upon it remain unchanged.

Now let us consider sound as an agent for changing the state of things in the air. It is one of the commonest and simplest agencies in the world, which we can experiment upon without difficulty. It is purely mechanical in its action. When a bomb explodes, a certain quantity of gas, say five or six cubic yards, is suddenly produced. It pushes aside and compresses the surrounding air in all directions, and this motion and compression are transmitted from one portion of the air to another. The amount of motion diminishes as the square of the distance; a simple calculation shows that at a quarter of a mile from the point of explosion it would not be one ten-thousandth of an inch. The condensation is only momentary; it may last the hundredth or the thousandth of a second, according to the suddenness and violence of the explosion; then elasticity restores the air to its original condition and everything is just as it was before the explosion. A thousand detonations can produce no more effect upon the air, or upon the watery vapor in it, than a thousand rebounds of a small boy's rubber ball would produce upon a stone wall. So far as the compression of the air could produce even a momentary effect, it would be to prevent rather than to cause condensation of its vapor, because it is productive of heat, which produces evaporation, not condensation.

The popular notion that sound may produce rain is founded principally upon the supposed fact that great battles have been followed by heavy rains. This notion, I believe, is not confirmed

by statistics; but, whether it is or not, we can say with confidence that it was not the sound of the cannon that produced the rain. That sound as a physical factor is quite insignificant would be evident were it not for our fallacious way of measuring it. The human ear is an instrument of wonderful delicacy, and when its tympanum is agitated by a sound we call it a "concussion," when, in fact, all that takes place is a sudden motion back and forth of a tenth, a hundredth, or a thousandth of an inch, accompanied by a slight momentary condensation. After these motions are completed the air is exactly in the same condition as it was before; it is neither hotter nor colder; no current has been produced, no moisture added.

If the reader is not satisfied with this explanation, he can try a very simple experiment which ought to be conclusive. If he will explode a grain of dynamite, the concussion within a foot of the point of explosion will be greater than that which can be produced by the most powerful bomb at a distance of a quarter of a mile. In fact, if the latter can condense vapor a quarter of a mile away, then anybody can condense vapor in a room by slapping his hands. Let us therefore try slapping our hands, and see how long we must continue before a cloud begins to form.

What we have just said applies principally to the condensation of invisible vapor. It may be asked whether, if clouds are already formed, something may not be done to accelerate their condensation into raindrops large enough to fall to the ground. This also may be the subject of experiment. Let us stand in the steam escaping from a kettle and slap our hands. W shall see whether the steam condenses into drops. I am sure the experiment will be a failure; and no other conclusion is possible than that the production of rain by sound or explosions is out of the question.

It must, however, be added that the laws under which the impalpable particles of water in clouds agglomerate into drops of rain are not yet understood, and that opinions differ on this subject. Experiments to decide the question are needed, and it is to be hoped that the Weather Bureau will undertake them. For anything we know to the contrary, the agglomeration may be facilitated by smoke in the air. If it be really true that rains have been produced by great battles, we may say with confidence that they were produced by the smoke from the burning powder rising into the clouds and forming nuclei for the agglom-

eration into drops, and not by the mere explosion. If this be the case, if it was the smoke and not the sound that brought the rain, then by burning gunpowder and dynamite we are acting much like Charles Lamb's Chinamen who practised the burning of their houses for several centuries before finding out that there was any cheaper way of securing the coveted delicacy of roast pig.

But how, it may be asked, shall we deal with the fact that Mr. Dyrenforth's recent explosions of bombs under a clear sky in Texas were followed in a few hours, or a day or two, by rains in a region where rain was almost unknown? I know too little about the fact, if such it be, to do more than ask questions about it suggested by well-known scientific truths. If there is any scientific result which we can accept with confidence, it is that ten seconds after the sound of the last bomb died away, silence resumed her sway. From that moment everything in the air—humidity, temperature, pressure, and motion—was exactly the same as if no bomb had been fired. Now, what went on during the hours that elapsed between the sound of the last bomb and the falling of the first drop of rain? Did the aqueous vapor already in the surrounding air slowly condense into clouds and raindrops in defiance of physical laws? If not, the hours must have been occupied by the passage of a mass of thousands of cubic miles of warm, moist air coming from some other region to which the sound could not have extended. Or was Jupiter Pluvius awakened by the sound after two thousand years of slumber, and did the laws of nature become silent at his command? When we transcend what is scientifically possible, all suppositions are admissible; and we leave the reader to take his choice between these and any others he may choose to invent.

One word in justification of the confidence with which I have cited established physical laws. It is very generally supposed that most great advances in applied science are made by rejecting or disproving the results reached by one's predecessors. Nothing could be farther from the truth. As Huxley has truly said, the army of science has never retreated from a position once gained. Men like Ohm and Maxwell have reduced electricity to a mathematical science, and it is by accepting, mastering, and applying the laws of electric currents which they discovered and expounded that the electric light, electric railway, and all other applications of electricity have been developed. It is by applying and

utilizing the laws of heat, force, and vapor laid down by such men as Carnot and Regnault that we now cross the Atlantic in six days. These same laws govern the condensation of vapor in the atmosphere; and I say with confidence that if we ever do learn to make it rain, it will be by accepting and applying them, and not by ignoring or trying to repeal them.

How much the indisposition of our government to secure expert scientific evidence may cost it is strikingly shown by a recent example. It expended several million dollars on a tunnel and water-works for the city of Washington, and then abandoned the whole work. Had the project been submitted to a commission of geologists, the fact that the rock-bed under the District of Columbia would not stand the continued action of water would have been immediately reported, and all the money expended would have been saved. The fact is that there is very little to excite popular interest in the advance of exact science. Investigators are generally quiet, unimpressive men, rather diffident, and wholly wanting in the art of interesting the public in their work. It is safe to say that neither Lavoisier, Galvani, Ohm, Regnault, nor Maxwell could have gotten the smallest appropriation through Congress to help make discoveries which are now the pride of our century. They all dealt in facts and conclusions quite devoid of that grandeur which renders so captivating the project of attacking the rains in their aërial stronghold with dynamite bombs

S. NEWCOMB.

CHILE AND HER CIVIL WAR.

BY CAPTAIN JOSÉ Mª. SANTA CRUZ, LATE COMMANDER OF THE "HUASCAR."

CHILE had for more than half a century enjoyed peace and tranquillity within her borders, and her citizens, realizing that the uninterrupted progress and prosperity of their country were owing to this fact, were determined to maintain peace at any cost. They had before their eyes the example of their less fortunate sister republics in South America, whose slow development has been due to the instability caused by their frequent revolutions.

Mr. Balmaceda, who knew the Chilian citizens' inborn abhorrence of revolution, took advantage of it to abuse the powers conferred on him, and attacked the most cherished rights of the people, such as their right of public meeting, the liberty of the press, and their electoral right.

All our administrations under the rule of honest Presidents had been so free from corruption that we believed implicitly in the honesty and good faith of our magistrates; and it was not till we became convinced that Mr. Balmaceda was determined to name his own successor, in case he could not, even against constitutional provisions, perpetuate himself in office, that we came to suspect that his determination was prompted by his anxiety to screen himself from the exposure which would result in case his successor was freely elected by the people.

This insistence on the part of the President that he should name his successor was what led the different parties to unite against the President in order to insure to the people the free choice of their candidates.

The officers of the Chilian Navy, while they have always taken a deep interest in the welfare of their country, have always kept aloof from the ardent political conflicts. But there are

times when it is impossible for a citizen who loves his country to remain passive and indifferent, and the officers of the navy, whose principal duty it is to defend their country from the attack of foreign foes, felt on the 1st of January last that as the citizens of a republic they must defend her from the attack of her enemies from within. The constitution had been violated and trampled upon; it was their duty to uphold and defend it.

Our constitution provides that the strength of the naval and land forces must be fixed annually by Congress, and without such a law they can have no legal existence.

The President had deliberately closed Congress when it was assembled with the object of passing this law, and refused to summon it again for this purpose ; and inasmuch as the law expired on the 31st of December, after this date neither the army nor navy could exist legally.

After the 1st of January those offending against military discipline were tried in accordance with the regulations, but the attorney general of the army gave a decision in which he declared that, inasmuch as the annual law had not been passed by Congress, these men could not be held by a military court.

The President endeavored to obtain from all the officers of the army their written pledges of unconditional support, and all who refused to give such pledges were imprisoned by order of Mr. Balmaceda. These officers then appealed to the Supreme Court, and the government did everything in its power to influence the court to deny its protection to these officers ; but the purity of our judges was proof against such influence, and the court decided that the officers should be set at liberty, as they had committed no military offence, and at the same time sustained the attorney general by deciding that the army and navy had no legal existence.

The President, however, refused to obey the mandates of our Supreme Court, and closed it.

In the meantime the President issued a proclamation to the country, in which he declared that he would continue to spend the public moneys as he pleased, and would maintain the army and navy without the authorization of Congress. This was a direct violation of the constitution, and Congress, considering that this was one of the cases provided for in that instrument giving to it a right to declare the President incapable of holding

office, formally deposed him, and empowered Captain Montt, of the navy, to assume the command in order to reëstablish constitutional order in the country.

A similar request was made to the army, but, unfortunately, Mr. Balmaceda had for a long time past been making his preparations for a *coup d'état*, and had imprisoned the leading officers who had not submitted to his dictation, and who would not lend their services to promote the ruin of their country.

The officers of the navy did not for a moment vacillate in obeying the orders of Congress. All they asked was that the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Deputies should establish themselves on board in order that they might act in conjunction with their commander in all that was necessary to secure the triumph of such a sacred cause.

In compliance with so just a petition, Señor Waldo Silva, vice-president of the Senate, and Señor Barros Luco, president of the Chamber of Deputies, came on board the fleet, and established a provisional junta, together with Captain Montt.

It was confidently believed that the army would join the navy in its patriotic efforts; and had this been the case, the President would have been forced to summon Congress to pass the necessary laws in order that the government might be conducted in a constitutional manner. Nothing, however, was further from the President's mind than the assembling of Congress: on the contrary he had determined to banish the most prominent leaders to Pascua Island, a Chilian possession 3,000 miles distant on the Pacific Ocean; and he had, with this in view, ordered the corvette "O'Higgins" to be fully provisioned and to hold herself in readiness to sail at a moment's notice, carrying away the leaders of Congress. This fact in itself produced the greatest indignation against the President, for the inviolablity of Congressmen had ever been respected.

On the 7th of January the President published a manifesto in which he declared, without any attempt at concealment, that he would henceforth be a dictator, assuming all public power. He had little need to make such declaration, for he had practically been such from the 1st of January, when he had declared his determination to disburse the public funds according to his will.

Henceforth there was no respect for law and order; the

people's most sacred rights were everywhere violated; Senators and Representatives were thrown into prison, and those supposed to sympathize with the cause of Congress were subjected to the cruelest torture. The newspapers were closed; the right of meeting was not allowed to the citizens; the courts, the only guarantees of justice, were set aside, and martial law was proclaimed throughout the land.

It is not easy to imagine the indignation which these outrages produced in a country whose citizens had so long enjoyed the fullest liberty. Even those that had been to some extent indifferent were now aroused to the full significance of the calamity which had befallen their country through the vanity and criminality of a man whose head had been turned by the flattery of his partisans and by his evident desire to maintain his power.

The fleet which supported Congress was composed of the following vessels: the two ironclads "Blanco Encalada" and "Almirante Cochrane," the monitor "Huascar," the cruiser "Esmeralda," the corvette "O'Higgins," and the gunboat "Magallanes." The corvette "Abtao," at that time on a voyage of instruction for midshipmen, joined the fleet as soon as she arrived in Chili.

On the night of the 6th the "Blanco," "Esmeralda," and "O'Higgins" left the harbor of Valparaiso and went to Quinteros, twenty miles to the north, to join the "Cochrane" and "Magallanes," and there the fleet's support of Congress was ratified by all the crews.

The "Huascar" was left in Valparaiso because she was not seaworthy and was undergoing extensive repairs. On the following day an attempt was made by Balmaceda to restore her armament and to put her in a seagoing condition, in order, if possible, to make some resistance to the fleet.

Captain Montt saw that possession of her by the dictator might be a source of embarrassment to the fleet, and he therefore entered the bay, and, having manned a sufficient number of boats, she was taken and towed out, and, having been repaired, proved a most useful addition to the fleet, taking the port of Taltal and there obtaining funds as well as a good supply of arms and ammunition, which enabled the patriotic citizens of that place to form a battalion that was destined to lend the most efficient services in subsequent engagements.

There is probably no ironclad in existence which can boast such a glorious history as the "Huascar." She was originally constructed for the government of Peru. During an uprising in that country in May, 1877, she was taken by the insurgents, and, as the government was unable to capture her, it issued a decree calling her crew "rebels" and authorizing her capture. The "Huascar" seized some lighters of coal belonging to English citizens, and the British admiral, being advised of this, sent two English men-of-war, the "Shah" and the "Amethyst," to seize her. An engagement took place which was without result. During the engagement the "Shah" fired several Whitehead torpedoes against the "Huascar," which did not take effect, thus showing the difficulty of successfully using that instrument of war against a vessel in motion on the high seas. The "Huascar" successfully eluded her pursuers, and subsequently surrendered to the authorities.

In our late war with Peru and Bolivia she rendered efficient service, and was able to annoy our fleet, for, owing to her superior speed, she escaped capture at the hands of our slower ironclads.

Finally, at Angamos, she was entrapped and captured after a stubborn fight, in which she received forty-five eight-inch shells in her hull. This may be regarded as the first naval encounter between ironclads, and was useful for the lessons that could be derived therefrom, which were not without their application to future naval constructions. In the first place it showed that, although the upper compartments of the ship were entirely destroyed, she was able, after slight repairs had been effected, to make a voyage of 600 miles; it likewise demonstrated that the plan of a revolving turret such as she had was ineffective in rough seas. After undergoing repairs, she proved her usefulness to us in the future bombardments of the war.

Returning to our narrative of the civil war, we have to refer to the utterly unprepared condition of those favoring Congress. So unpremeditated a step found us without the elements of war, and the navy, though well equipped for a naval campaign, could not furnish our men with the elements of a campaign on land.

But nothing could daunt the courage of those who were fighting for the cause of freedom; they made the most of everything, and were able to undertake those movements on land which resulted so successfully and are a title of honor to our brave soldiers and sailors.

The movement was so unexpected that many of the officers who were on shore duty were in ignorance of it. The dictator did all in his power to prevent their joining the fleet, but most of them succeeded in escaping and joined the vessels.

The dictator, in order to prevent the army from joining the movement against him, trebled their salaries and appealed to them as against the navy, endeavoring to create a feeling of rivalry, such as has existed in many countries, by telling our soldiers that the men of the navy considered themselves superior to them.

The dictator had replaced the officers in command of the different regiments by those pledged to his support; and our soldiers, although naturally brave, are unfortunately ignorant and docile and can be easily led.

A large number of the leading officers of the army, who had until then escaped imprisonment, managed to join the fleet, and to-day are leading our army.

From the first our expeditions by sea were fortunate, and we were able to obtain an abundant supply of provisions; and everywhere men begged to be taken on board in order to fight in our cause. We were obliged to refuse many, because we had no arms to supply them with.

The want of muskets was the most serious difficulty we had to contend against, for, even counting some obtained in our expedition against Quinteros, we could muster only 400, including those on board the men-of-war. With this number we began our campaigns, and to-day we possess an army of more than 12,000 well-equipped men.

The transport "Amazonas" and the "O'Higgins" were sent to Coquimbo, the province where Balmaceda claimed unanimous support; they landed sixty men and took possession of the whole province, thus enabling us to obtain an abundant supply of provisions and to form in two days the first constitutional regiment with the arms there found. Providence and the dictator were thus supplying our arms.

The "Cachapoal," one of our transports, went north and took possession of most of the ports on her way up. Everywhere our men were enthusiastically received, and the small garrisons stationed at those ports gladly changed their allegiance, and joined the ranks of those who were defending constitutional liberty in order to fight against the dictator and his tyranny.

The first serious encounter between our troops and those of the dictator took place on February 7 at Pisagua, where we gained a signal victory and took 150 soldiers, who that very day joined our ranks.

The next and most important event was the taking of Iquique, where our troops found about 2,000,000 rounds of ammunition which the troops of the dictator left behind in the hurry of their flight. This enabled us to fight the battle of Pozo Almonte, where our troops, although inferior in numbers, were able to obtain a magnificent victory, completely routing their opponents, thus leaving us in unmolested possession of the richest province in Chile.

We now organized our army and sent an expedition of 1,500 to take the province of Antofagasta, which was defended by 2,500 soldiers of the dictator, who took flight on the approach of our troops because the officers did not have faith in the men under their command; two companies deserted from the dictator's troops in order to fight on our side against the despotism which they abhorred.

Our next move was against Tacna, and there again at our approach the dictator's troops fled into Peruvian territory, where they gave up their arms. The troops that fled from Antofagasta escaped into the Argentine territory, having to cross the Andes twice in order to get back to the territory occupied by the dictator.

Being now in tranquil possession of three provinces, our government was formally organized on the 12th of April last at Iquique, in order that all our territory should be under one administration.

Soon after this we directed an expedition against the province of Atacama, where the troops of the dictator, following the examples of their companions in arms at Tacna and Antofagasta, made no resistance and fled to foreign territory.

It can be easily seen from the above that the Chilian soldiers under Balmaceda, brave as our soldiers are, appear to have made up their minds not to seriously oppose the advance of their brother soldiers that fight for liberty.

Being in undisputed possession of four provinces which it is impossible for Balmaceda to recapture, with a regularly-organized government, abundant revenues, and the enthusiasm of a people who are fighting in a good cause, Bolivia recognized our belliger-

ency, and we confidently believe that other governments will accord us "like recognition." To the people of the great country of freedom whose ancestors fought so bravely in defence of their threatened liberties, and who have ever given their generous sympathy to those who were struggling against tyranny and oppression, we confidently appeal, in the certainty that they will be no less generous in their sympathy for those of our countrymen who are to-day shedding their blood for the cause of freedom and good government.

AUGUST 9, 1891.

As some days will elapse before the publication of the above review of the situation in Chile prior to the fall of Balmaceda, I am indebted to the courtesy of the editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for being able to add a few words respecting the closing scenes of the struggle in Chile for the supremacy of right over might.

The apparent lull which succeeded the capture of the province of Atacama was owing to the necessity of organizing our army in Iquique; but unfortunately we had neither arms nor ammunition available.

The detention of the "Itata" in a port of the United States delayed our operations for nearly two months. In the meantime, however, our soldiers were being drilled with Manlicher rifles, of which we had a great number, but for which we had no ammunition.

On the 3d of July the transport "Maipu" arrived at Iquique with several thousand rifles, twenty-two cannon, four Krupp field batteries, and an immense amount of ammunition, not only for the arms she brought, but for the Manlicher rifles already in our possession. Iquique was wild with joy, and our approaching triumph was no longer problematical.

While the enthusiasm in Tarapaca was unbounded, and while our ranks might have been filled from that province alone, the Congress, always mindful of the requirements of the industries of the surrounding country, was constrained to refuse innumerable offers of service in our army. The province of Aconcagua, meanwhile, claimed the honor of furnishing two regiments, and asked only for arms. And it was owing to this that our first landing of troops was at Caldera, where a thorough organization of our

army could be made, and where we would be nearer the centre of operations and our objective point, Valparaiso. Furthermore, our being in Caldera obliged Balmaceda to reënforce his contingent in Coquimbo, thus weakening his own force in and around Valparaiso and Santiago.

Our preparations completed, our army embarked on the several vessels of war and transports, and made a successful landing at Quinteros, a small inlet twenty miles north of Valparaiso. It is impossible not to wonder at the courage—not to call it temerity—of an army of 8,000 men disembarking in that little port and ready and anxious to give battle to Balmaceda's 18,000 troops, apparently secure in their own intrenchments and officered by generals of well-tried experience.

The crossing of the river Aconcagua, under shelter of the guns of our vessels of war, made it evident to Balmaceda and his generals that we were in earnest, and they fell back on Valparaiso, near which city the bulk of their army was encamped.

During the following days there was much skirmishing, each side endeavoring to secure a vantage-ground, and then came the final battle, which is now part of history, and which gave us complete possession of Valparaiso, and twenty-four hours later of Santiago.

It was only when defeated that Balmaceda could reconcile himself to the fact that his much-vaunted popularity was a myth. Abandoned by his demoralized and mercenary soldiers, he and his late accomplices in the dictatorship succeeded in escaping from an outraged populace, and until now no one knows the whereabouts of the ex-President of Chile. Far from the scene of his early and honorable triumphs, in exile and in some foreign land, and tortured by remorse, he may pass the remnant of his life; and added to that remorse will be the crushing of his inordinate vanity and the never-dying remembrance of how he fell, like Lucifer, from his high pinnacle of power in a sovereign state to the lowest depths of ignominy.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1891. JOSÉ MA. SANTA CRUZ.

SPECULATION IN WHEAT.

BY B. P. HUTCHINSON.

SPECULATION in breadstuffs and grains has been, and is, the subject of a great deal of unreasonable legislation and sermonizing. There is a large class of would-be philanthropists who do not understand the facts or the first principles of what they are talking about. Now, in the first place, grain is a commodity, and every man has a right to buy and sell it. He has a right to buy it as cheap and sell it as dear as he can, and he must always buy and sell at the market price. This market price is the universal price all over the world on any given day, and no man or combination of men can stand up against it. They may take measures to influence it, but they cannot positively control it. It is too mighty, too immense. We can influence the water-power of Niagara; but let us find the man or men who can stop the cataract!

All operations in the grains benefit the grower, because they cause him to get his price paid sooner, and they are just as likely to put up prices as to depress them; therefore the average is maintained. But if there were no speculation, the farmers could only sell their grain to local buyers, who would be liable to get full and stop buying, and then the farmer would be compelled to wait for customers; and in the meantime a mortgage might be foreclosed on his farm, even while the wheat in his bins would more than satisfy the mortgage, if converted into cash. But speculation, flashing its news over the wires from one side of the world to the other, keeps the market always open to him. Chicago, St. Louis, Minneapolis, practically lay down gold dollars on the threshold of the most remote barn in Dakota; and all this just because these cities furnish busy speculators, whose brains and knowledge command the moneyed resources of the whole

United States so far as wanted, and so far as every dollar is represented by standard grain at the market price, less a fair margin for the bankers.

Grain operations benefit the consumer also; because when there is an excess of breadstuffs, a low price stimulates consumption and gives him a big loaf; and when there is a deficit, a high price enforces economy and teaches him to eat more potatoes and esculent roots and less bread, and thus to give his neighbor a chance at the loaf. In plentiful times men are apt to waste flour. When there is a short crop, then speculation in the form of capital—provident, thrifty capital, the daughter of economy and the sworn enemy of wastefulness—steps in, takes the precious wheat, and says: "Now each of you inhabitants of the planet can have your share, and as much as is good for you; but these are times of dearth, and in order to keep you from using more than your proper share, the price must be raised on you." This follows from a wise law of trade—which we cannot do away with, and ought not to try to do away with—that scarce things must be dear. Make the loaf small and dear if the crop is small; then no one will waste it. Diamonds are small and dear, and no one wastes them; but a man can fling diamonds into the sea with a better conscience than he can waste bread when the world is hungry.

We do not really know how wise capital is in dealing with food until we put an extreme case. Suppose there were but one bushel of wheat in the world, and a parcel of hungry men were fighting for it, to eat it, and thus ignorantly destroy the future food crops of the planet. Capital steps in and lays its hands on the bag and says: "The price of this bushel of wheat is five hundred millions of dollars." This disperses the small hungry mob, and saves humanity in its total. That bushel of wheat, if really the only surviving bushel, would be worth more than Manhattan Island with every building on it full of merchandise. This is an extreme case, but the principle holds good. Capital guards against waste and protects the future of the people. It is like a strong soldier with a shield guarding a city gate against marauders. And speculation is only another name for capital in active motion.

If the Russian Czar has forbidden the export of rye from his dominions, he is strictly within his rights, if he is indeed the father of his people, as he claims to be; but this measure is tem-

porary. Other countries will get through the season without it, and their people will be encouraged to till more acres and raise more rye. Russia will have an unsold surplus and will have lost valuable customers. This is a general way of looking at it; we do not know all the particulars. The report of the Czar's ukase has made richer every American farmer who has rye on hand, and also every miller and dealer who has it. And the bakers still furnish the usual-sized loaves of rye bread for five and ten cents. A number of worthy people have been benefited, and no one has been hurt; at least in the United States. People who sold rye futures short have lost money, but that is a business risk, and if they do not grumble, the public is not called upon to shed tears over their losses.

I was connected with a big movement in grain in September, 1888. That movement raised prices and diminished the size of loaves until the next crop. There was a short crop in the United States and Canada that year; wheat had been hammered down to seventy cents or thereabouts, during two or three years previous, and it seemed only fair to give the farmers a chance. The farmers did not get all the profit of the rise, but they got a good deal, probably their fair share. Labor must not grudge a division with capital. It takes capital to move and market the products of labor; and both are entitled to receive wages.

I have studied this subject closely and for a long time; and if farmers are hostile to boards of trade and futures, in my opinion they are mistaken. The speculator it is who is bitten and gets hurt nine times out of ten. Look back fifty years. How many have gone where the woodbine twineth, as "Jim" Fisk said. There is still one speculator, gigantic in schemes, though small of body, who, when his counsel asked him, "Well, how far do you want to go with this thing?" replied: "To any extent that does n't land me in the penitentiary." What do you think of operations that just graze the door of the penitentiary? But you cannot overissue grain. You must deliver or go broke. Dishonest dealings in grain are almost impossible, but many of the speculators fail to fulfill their contracts. The farmers do not lose by such men. A speculator fails and his margins are wiped out, but the owner of a thousand bushels of wheat has got his wheat, and wheat is still another name for cash at the board of trade.

When the operator overdoes things, the penalty follows closely. I once figured that under no circumstances could more than three millions of bushels of wheat be tendered to me on my contracts for September. On the last day of the month, over and above the three millions, came three hundred and thirty thousand bushels, and it was just this, and not the other, that seemed excessive. Wheat from St. Louis and from Detroit met that day and poured down on my shoulders! Mr. Cleveland paid me a fine compliment without intending to do so. Some Ohio men sent a delegation to Washington to get Harper, of the defunct Fidelity Bank, out of the penitentiary. "Ben" Butterworth (now secretary of the World's Fair) was spokesman. He said to the President: "Harper didn't do anything different from Mr. Hutchinson in September grain; he tried to corner the market." Mr. Cleveland looked at him. "Oh yes," he said, "I see a difference: Mr. Hutchinson used his own money, not that of depositors and stockholders. An owner differs from a trustee."

Let us look for a moment at conditions which must please every good American citizen, and tend to make him feel proud of his country. The farms of our great Northwest may not go on feeding Europe forever; they will be better employed in furnishing bread for the immense population that will occupy, before many years, the territory between the Mississippi and the Atlantic. The South will raise more wheat and corn ultimately, but, after all, the Northwest will always help feed the Southwest and the East.

Minneapolis is the great primary home market for choice wheat. That city turns out more barrels of flour than any other milling place of the world. Minneapolis now excels Buda-Pesth in eastern Germany (Austro-Hungary) as a flour-producer. Until lately Buda-Pesth was the star milling city of the planet; now Minneapolis eclipses her. Minneapolis was settled by New England men. One of the brightest and most famous of these millers, Charles Pillsbury, whose flour is equal to the best in the world, came from Swanzey, in Cheshire County, N. H., in which rustic old town Denman Thompson located the scenes of the "Old Homestead."

As to the outlook in all directions, leaving out Asia and Africa: the grain crops of Germany are short; France undoubtedly short; Great Britain will not reap an average; and Russia

short—not a usual amount for export. But I never yet have seen a short crop that was not disappointing to those who look for absolute famine. Unexpected supplies turn up in unlooked-for quarters. There are numbers of small and far-seeing farmers who secretly hoard grain against short seasons. These supplies will all come out this year and mitigate the dearth.

South America will have from the Argentine Republic a surplus of perhaps 30,000,000 bushels. For this Brazil would seem to be the most natural customer, but the Argentines are so deeply in debt to England and British traders are so powerful in Buenos Ayres that probably England will get it all. The United States will therefore continue to supply Brazil with flour, and she will pay with bills on London drawn at Rio. Our direct trade with Brazil mainly consists in paying her cash for coffee. Reciprocity does not yet amount to much as to Brazil.

The United States beyond all dispute has an enormous crop. At the time when I write these lines the wheat berry is beyond danger from frost, insect, or mildew ; and corn nearly so. Corn will not be an excessive crop. Oats are unusually heavy in weight ; they will average one-quarter heavier than last year. That is clear gain of nourishment, and therefore of value.

No one can accurately state how many bushels of wheat we shall export, but we can supply all deficiencies and money will flow freely to us from Europe, if we do not put our prices too high. There *is* such a thing as charging more for a loaf of bread than the average customer can pay. We must not forget that the working classes everywhere are the main consumers of bread ; and these people have only their wages to spend. We might, if excessively greedy of money, drive them to using substitutes, and that would be bad for both sides. In the interior of Cuba, San Domingo, and Brazil the poorer classes never see bread at all ; they make a cake of yucca or cassava roots, and that is their bread. It is a farinaceous food, and it answers because it *has* to answer. The Scandinavian peasants mix half flour and half ground tree-bark in their loaf. If we crowd them too hard, they can go through one season on one-quarter flour and three-quarters bark. These facts must be considered by our dealers and speculators.

Some of the reasons why we supply Europe are these : We have a new soil and plenty of acreage. We use implements that

cheapen the cost of production and make the labor of harvesting seem like the sport of the fairies in the story-book. A large farmer, for instance Oliver Dalrymple, who has a world-wide reputation, gets up early in the morning and starts from ten to forty reapers. The field may occupy from five hundred to five thousand acres, smooth and level. Each reaper cuts and binds. That field has a different look at evening. The farmer states that after the grain from these fields is threshed out it costs him about thirty cents a bushel, with a good yield. "Dollar wheat" at Minneapolis, or Lake Superior City, or Duluth, means a great deal to this farmer.

English syndicates have invested largely in flour-production in the Northwest. They are interested in the great Minneapolis mills, which are among the industrial triumphs of the nineteenth century. There are also syndicates that carry on the business of buying wheat throughout the back country, storing it in elevators, and sending it to the mills as needed. These syndicates are backed by practically unlimited capital; and since they always have money, or grain to show for their money, their credit is above question.

There is no doubt that gold will come to the United States from Europe in exchange for grain. Some writers say that Europe will send us goods instead of money; but goods are not legal-tender, and I do not see why we should take goods as payment unless we want such kind of payment. This money will permeate all the channels of business, create great prosperity, and stimulate all sorts of speculation, healthy and unhealthy. A great many people will have money who do not know how to use it; therefore they will lose it. These sums of money, as they are being tossed about hither and thither, will eventually become lodged in the hands of men who know how to get and to keep capital. The years 1891–92, with their wheat crop, will represent a memorable era in trade history.

B. P. HUTCHINSON.

NEW LIFE IN CHINA.

BY THE HON. JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG, FORMERLY UNITED STATES MINISTER TO CHINA.

MUCH is written in these current days about China. Stories of misadventure, riot, and misfortune; of secret societies; of a revival of the Tae Ping rebellion; of plots against the dynasty; of the harrying of the poor devoted missionaries; the sad lesson devolving upon them, as it has devolved upon many holy men who have gone before them—that those who follow the cross must, on occasion, bear the cross; sporadic unrest throughout the empire; appeals to domestic patriotism against the foreign devil; and—what concerns the American more than anything else—the steady diminution of American influence, until the flag, which in the days of Burlingame had the prestige almost of a protectorate in Peking, which at one time was the dominant flag in Chinese commerce, has no authority beyond certain domestic offices at the consulates and legation. We may well ask what it means! I should call it the awakening of the new life in China.

"The European war," said John T. Delane, the late eminent editor of the London *Times*, at the close of the late conflict between Germany and France, "has minimized Continental events for a long time. Asia is now the field. The coming question will be Asiatic. It belongs to the next generation. I should advise my younger friends to bend their thoughts in that direction. It may come with the youngest and the oldest civilizations—the United States and China—face to face! It may come with Russia as an important factor. But it will come, and there is more involved in its solution than in any apparent Continental issue now."

The fading-away of American influence in China, our first immediate interest in studying these phenomena, is not to be viewed without concern. The failure of Russell & Co., the

latest news from China of special import to us, is not alone a mere commercial incident. The Russells went back to the early part of the century, to the time when Astor and Girard were in the China trade, when the East India Company was a political as well as a commercial power. From the Russell enterprises came some of the great fortunes of modern commerce. Because of their commercial genius the American flag has been seen in every part of China. They saved Chinese prestige when it was threatened by France. There was a time, and that not far away, when China would not have permitted the failure of this house any more than the English money power would have permitted the failure of the Barings. It was when China, pressed by French invasions in Annam, restless under German aggression at Swatow, fearing Russian encroachments on the Mongolian frontier, and apprehensive that England might make Port Hamilton, in the North, what Hong Kong had been so long in the South, saw in the United States the one strong power whose advice could by no chance be inimical to her interests, and in a venerable and far-seeing American house a commercial representative of American ideas.

I have seen no reason to attribute the Russell failure to the caprice or emergency of commerce. There are houses like those of the Barings and the Rothschilds that cannot be permitted to fail, at least for purely commercial reasons. The house of Russell belonged to this category. There were two influences only that could have destroyed it: one was the opposition of British interests; the other, the decay of American influence because of the indifference or animosity of China.

The antagonism of British interests is, I presume, to be expected in the East, at all events upon the theory that sentiment has no place in business. The student of our American financial system cannot fail to note the curious fact that while American policy, American money, and American financial influence have been concentrated upon the advancement of British commercial power in the West, British policy, British money, and British financial influence are prompt towards the destruction of American commercial power in the East. It was only the other day when the resources of the United States were strained and business embarrassed to save the London money market from the consequences of London follies in the Argentine Republic. And

yet at the time when the firm hand of New York was steadying the reeling credit of London the hand of London was tearing down the American flag from the last of our great establishments in the East. Under any just appreciation of what belonged to American prestige on the Pacific, with any reasonable protection from the government, with a fraction of the aid, moral and otherwise, which Great Britain bestows upon her interests all over the world, and especially in China, this disaster, political as well as commercial, would never have taken place.

Why should China have permitted what is for the present the extinction of American commercial influence in the East? In 1885 the American flag was on every coast and in every navigable stream of China, covering the largest commercial fleet in the East. That represented the good feeling between the two nations. Now it may be found, if at all, upon some poor forlorn petroleum tramp steamer edging its way towards unfriendly wharves. Let the answer be found in the fact that in our dealings with China we have maintained a policy of contumely which finally has awakened perhaps the last emotion to be aroused in the Oriental mind—the emotion of self-respect. Take the emigration question. There has never been a time when China would not have gone further to suppress emigration than our extreme friends in California could have demanded. We must, however, impugn the good faith of the Chinese in carrying out a policy which they themselves initiated and volunteered, and treat them in a manner that any other power would have regarded as an invitation to war. We must do this, and at the same time expect from China the benefits of amity and a complete harmonious understanding.

Let me illustrate our persistence in this strange, perverse policy. A recent Washington decree directs that any person of a presumably Chinese origin who does not possess certain tokens or papers shall be returned to China as "the country from which he came." It was at one time within my personal knowledge, and I have learned of no official evidence to the contrary, that there was no record in any executive department of Washington of a Chinaman coming to the United States from China. From British possessions, like the Straits Settlements, where their kinsmen have lived for a century or two; from the Dutch colonies in Java; from Hong Kong, as much of a

British possession as Londonderry,—but in no instance from China. Have we any right, then, to send to China people who have abandoned that country and the protection of its flag? Would we return presumable Englishmen to Liverpool who had come to us from Havana or St. Thomas, because they were apparently of the Anglo-Saxon race? Would England permit it, or allow to pass without protest an executive order which, with the knowledge in executive departments that Englishmen did not come to the United States, could deport whoever were supposed to be Englishmen to Great Britain?

This may be a small, perhaps a technical, matter—a trifle to come between nations. But history shows that nations—wayward as women or children—are rarely disturbed except by small things. The trifle is the spark, and the spark soon becomes the flame. If there are reasons, the gravity of which I admit, which lead us to select the Chinese as the one Asiatic race that may not come to the United States; to welcome the Malay, the Arabian, the Hebrew, the Hindoo, the Japanese; to permit easy and unrestrained access, with special protection even, to the subtlest commercial intellects of Bombay and Constantinople, Jerusalem and Osaka, but to forbid those who come from Canton,—if such reasons exist, they may be explained, and with entire truth, as an indirect compliment to the intellectual power of the Chinese artificer and merchant. But having secured our restrictions and limitations, having done so with the assent of China, is there not every reason why we should maintain the closest political and commercial relations? The Chinese are our nearest neighbors. The ocean between us is not as wide as the ocean to Liverpool twenty years ago. China craves as necessities our cotton goods and petroleum. The cotton grows on our plantations; the petroleum comes from our caverns. There is no reason why the entire China trade, under a judicious system of political sympathy, might not be one of the most valuable assets in the sum of American maritime greatness. We have but to show China that we have no American interest in the East, aside from the Sandwich Islands, so near to us as the autonomy of her empire; that her independence is essential to our commercial strength in the Pacific; we have but to promulgate Monroe Doctrine in the East upon the lines laid down by Quincy Adams as pertinent to the Gulf of Mexico and the South American republics, to have

a moral weight in her destinies which no other power could hope to emulate or venture successfully to deny.

About the time the emigration business was coming to a head, and we were trying as well as we could to arrange the treaty of Mr. Trescot and Mr. Angell, we had our experiment with Corea. Since Solouque became Emperor of Hayti, with his Count of Marmalade, his Duke of Lemonade, and other fantastic creations, to the amusement of the cynical world, we have had no diplomatic travesty so grotesque as this in Corea. To us Corea should be as much a part of the Chinese Empire as Maine is a part of the United States. Our "treaty" with Corea was the transcript of an instrument dictated by the Chinese viceroy at Tientim. The convention itself recognized a dependence upon China as absolute as that of Massachusetts upon the republic. It was thought that Japan would be pleased to have Corea independent, or under her protectorate even, although I never knew a Japanese statesman who did not regard the ocean as a barrier as welcome against China as it is to England against the Continent. Russia was the only nation that could be served by an autonomous Corea, and the practical effect of the treaty was to place the United States in the position of an active instrument for the furtherance of Russian intrigue in Asia. This opinion, strengthened in China with so many abundant opportunities of observation, is confirmed by recent intelligence. A correspondent of the New York *Times*, writing from Shanghai on July 2, 1891, says: "Russian political agents have been steadily but secretly at work, for some time, throughout the entire peninsula, gradually preparing the people for the rule of the Czar"; and "Corea will pass from the list of the kingdoms of Asia and will become a province of the mighty Russian Empire."

When the substance of this proposed treaty was shown to me by Mr. Frelinghuysen in 1882, I expressed to that statesman the views I am now writing, and which I have never ceased to hold. In this opinion I was sustained by the illustrious authority of General Grant. The treaty, however, was signed precipitately, before I could reach Japan, and since then we have had no more difficult problem than this of Corea in our relations with China. The comedy of a mission to that country, of an actual legation there, of military experts to organize the Corean army, of a diplomatic adviser to direct the foreign affairs of the kingdom—all of

this would have been merry enough in one of the operas of Mr. Offenbach or Mr. Gilbert, or as a bit of Soulouquerie unrivalled ever since the poor old Haytian blackamoor with his Lemonades and Marmalades vanished amid undissuadable laughter. Amusing as it was, unhappily our relations with China were a most serious business. Whatever there was to us of negro minstrelsy and opera bouffe in our relations with Corea, to China it meant the shadow of the Great White Czar, moving towards a destiny ominous to China—moving under the inspiration and authority of the United States.

The policy of General Grant to which allusion is here made, and which governed the instructions with which I was honored by Mr. Frelinghuysen when I was in the diplomatic service, was based upon a careful study of the eastern question amid advantages such as no other foreigner ever enjoyed. It was a policy developed after careful study and confidential conversations with the Prince Regent and ministers of China, the Emperor and ministers of Japan. It was my privilege to be present at these interviews, and to know how deeply the ex-President was impressed by what he heard and saw. "What I would give," he said to me one afternoon at Enriokwan, as, walking in the gardens of the Emperor, we looked out upon the sea, "—what I would give to have known ten years ago what I know to-day!" What might he have given indeed, and what might America have given, had the just, intrepid policy towards the eastern nations which the genius of Grant evolved from the political conditions of the Pacific found fruition and encouragement, or been governed by his firm, enlightened will! In that lay the solution of the emigration question upon terms that would have satisfied all reasonable interests, no matter how conflicting; the maintenance of that commercial supremacy so necessary to our Pacific empire; the peaceful trending, under enlightened guidance, of the surplus populations of the Middle Empire towards the vast islands and continents wherein they could have the opportunity our own races have found in America and Australasia. There would have been no Soulouquerie in Corea, no hauling down the flag from our great establishments in the East. Hand in hand the oldest and the youngest of civilizations could have pursued their destiny, the genius of antiquity resting upon and strengthened by the genius of youth.

I presume this will be called a dream, even if it comes from the calmest and strongest head known in these modern American days. What General Grant, however, expressed in the free dom and vividness of personal intercourse, was spoken no less in public addresses wherein he weighed every word. "America," he said in one public speech, delivered to a company of Oriental noblemen, and memorable for the impression it made at the time, "—America has great interests in the East. She is your next-door neighbor. She is more affected by the eastern populations than any other power. She can never be insensible to what is doing here." "America has much to gain in the East ; no nation has greater interests ; but America has nothing to gain except what comes from the cheerful acquiescence of the eastern people and insures them as much benefit as it does us. I should be ashamed of my country if its relations with other nations, and especially with these ancient and most interesting empires in the East, were based upon any other idea."

And, again, upon an occasion even more memorable, when taking leave of the Emperor of Japan, General Grant addressed His Majesty in these weighty words : "It is my sincere desire to see Japan realize all possible strength and greatness, to see her as independent of foreign rule or dictation as any western nation now is, and to see affairs so directed by her as to command the respect of the civilized world." The importance attached to this declaration by General Grant may be inferred from the fact that before seeing the Emperor he wrote his speech. I was with him at the time and read these words from his manuscript.

If, therefore, it be a dream, it was that of an intrepid, original, wise man, impressed with what he saw, with the new and strange conditions surrounding Oriental life, its perplexities and its hopes, its helplessness as that of childhood, its strength with the matured wisdom of many centuries ; now and then bursting upon you with an appalling sense of knowledge and power. He had seen India and what men of our race have done in the forging of that vast empire. He had seen Egypt and what the same men were trying to do in that strange, mysterious, pathetic land. He had seen that, for every material advantage given to India, something of artistic, spiritual value—higher, perhaps, than material advantage—had been taken away. He had seen the art, the poetry, the culture, the sen-

timent of ingenious races stamped out under the influence of the sword and the spinning-jenny; he had seen how an empire was governed in Calcutta and Bombay for dividends and pensions in London; he was to see the swift progress in Japan of a "civilization" which might in time be a blessing, but thus far had shown only the symptoms of a disease; and he respected, as no one who looks deeply and sympathetically into the matter can fail to respect, the proud reserve of China, which prefers the traditions of the ages to the experiments of a day, which will not exchange the morals of Confucius for those of the London *Times*, and whose civilization when it moves will do so with the slow strength of the glacier, and not the turbulence of the rushing stream.

The beginning of the new movement in China, the awakening of the new life which, to my mind, underlies so many of the sporadic conditions of present unrest in the empire, may be attributed to the influence and personal character of Li Hung Chang, the Viceroy of the northern provinces, and virtual Prime Minister. From his Yamen come the ideas which slowly permeate the empire. When I was familiar with China, Tientsin, the home of the Viceroy, was ever the centre of a unique and progressive authority. The atmosphere of the Viceroy's Yamen was different from that of Canton, Foo Chow, Wuchang, or elsewhere. To pass from Hankow to Tientsin was like coming from China of the middle ages to what one might call the China of the nineteenth century. The personal qualities of the Viceroy had much to do with it. "I have seen," said General Grant to me on one occasion, "four great men in my journey—Bismarck, Beaconsfield, Gambetta, and Li Hung Chang. I am not sure that Li is not the greatest of the four." A friendship—I might say an intimacy—with the Viceroy for some years confirmed with me an opinion akin to this of General Grant. A strong, positive, dominant nature, with a firm will, an irascible temper, he had seen much of the foreigner, and—what the earnest Chinaman never thinks of doing—had adjusted the perspective, as it were, between his own and foreign lands. He had governing qualities. The soft, tranquil nature, the morrow and ever the morrow temperament which marks the Oriental, was foreign to him. Unlike any other Chinese statesman whom I then knew, he believed in war and in preparation for war. The one question which seemed to interest him was the military possibilities

of the empire. The one ruler who impressed his imagination was Grant, because he saw in him the soldier. Although a singularly accomplished man, and in times of peace assured of advancement even in China, where education means promotion, he had risen by arms and believed in arms. Almost the first wish he ever expressed to me was that the American government would allow him to send some Chinese lads to Annapolis and West Point, and it was hard to explain that the doors to these academies might open to Japanese and young gentlemen from South America, but not to Chinamen. It was his assured purpose, he told me, to have in China schools modelled upon the West Point and Annapolis principles, and he had gone so far as to have selected some point on the Yangtze near Nanking for the military and Chefoo for the naval station.

The incentive to these purposes was the war with France. This sad, mournful business, known in France as "the Tonquin incident," did more than any other agency to bring about the new life in China. I had bitter feelings on the subject at the time of the war, but I feel that I am speaking the better opinion of France when I say that nothing could have been more unfortunate for the republic. In every respect so causeless, so selfish, so much a violation of the elementary principles of international honesty, so indefensible from any point of view, its injustice sank deep into the Chinese mind, and injured every foreign interest in the empire. The fatuity of the French was shown in nothing so much as in sending as one of their representatives, with special plenipotentiary powers, a gentleman who had "won distinction in Egypt." To suppose that a political education acquired among the fellaheen of the Nile and Levantine merchants would avail against the subtile rulers of a most patient people, of a race upon whom the severest blows of conquerors who had almost conquered the world had made no more impression than so many blows upon the impalpable waves, foreshadowed the discomfiture of France. Although with the moral support of Germany, upon the astute Bismarck theory that the more Frenchmen there were in the swamps of Tonquin the fewer there would be on the Rhine; with the strong support of England, based upon the masterful, earnest character of England's great minister, Sir Harry Parkes; with Russia in sympathy, the paw of the bear slowly moving prone towards Corea,

with no aid but the indirect moral support of the United States, to whom the autonomy of China was of more concern than the political exigencies of Jules Ferry,—France was worsted. With that victory came the renaissance. I remember the eloquent fervor with which Li Hung Chang on one occasion summed up the situation; remember well his arraignment of foreign policies towards China, his resentment even towards American opinion,—the only time his temper ever led him upon that theme,—and his resolution to work without pausing until when China spoke it would be as other nations—with the hand on the hilt of the sword.

It was my duty about this time to make a tour of the open ports of China and inspect the consulates. There were public reasons—as much as any others the temper shown by the Viceroy—why special courtesies should be interchanged with the minor officials in the empire. The late Admiral John Lee Davis accompanied me, to that end, on board of the "Enterprise" man-of-war. At Canton, Foochow, Hankow, and other points there were functions given by us in honor of viceregal and other authorities. When possible, these assumed the form of a reception on board the man-of-war, men at general quarters, a drill, an inspection of the ship. Thus we would show something of our naval armaments, what discipline could do, what China perhaps might have to fear in the event of war. Among other such exhibitions was one at Shanghai before Li Hung Chang, at which His Excellency assisted for a couple of hours, and was shown every naval possibility. At Ningpo we entertained an official, his grade subordinate to that of a Viceroy, an amiable and able mandarin who studied the drill of the "Enterprise," and heard with satisfaction the admiral's exposition of the functions and the power and sweep of his artillery. We returned the call in state—admiral and staff in full dress—and were received with those delicate attentions which the Chinese know so well how to bestow. Ceremonies well under way, the mandarin asked the admiral if he would like to inspect the Chinese troops and see them drill. An infantry battalion was put through the manual of arms; English the word of command, English tactics, the drill elaborate and minute, embracing all that was required of an infantry soldier. To the eyes of the writer, a layman, nothing seemed more perfect as a bit of mechanism, alertness, skill, obedience, intelligence—a human machine, as the drilled battalion

should be. To the admiral it came as a revelation. "To think," he said to me afterwards, "that I actually gave that Chinaman a drill on board my ship to show how the thing was done, and now he gives me a drill to show me that his soldiers know more than my people could teach them." This, Admiral Davis said, was the most impressive incident he had seen in China.

What that conscientious and distinguished officer saw at Ningpo, what made this morning drill in the quadrangle of a Chinese Yamen impressive, was this: Here before him was the unit. Here around him were the infinite possibilities to which that unit might multiply. The military unit in Germany, in France, in the United States—we know what may come of that. But what imagination dare conceive to what this Chinese unit might grow from the infinite resources of this prodigious empire, once that its faculty of growth turned, like that of its neighbors, towards war?

Some of the possibilities of this military unit, as we saw it, may be understood when we remember the part the ancestors of these soldiers have played in the affairs of men. When England was resting under papal interdicts and King John was content to be a papal vassal, the armies of Genghis Khan were surging over China where Li Hung Chang now reigns; over Honan and the countries of the Upper Yangtze; over Shangtung, the cradle of Confucius, to threaten India, and hold Asia Minor. Under another chief of the same race, even his grandson, Timour, Persia and Asia Minor were conquered, Syria occupied, Moscow threatened, India invaded, Delhi taken, and even Europe menaced with invasion. The two most important events since the Christian era—that is to say, the Mongol invasion under Genghis Khan in the thirteenth and of Timour in the fourteenth century, with, among other consequences, the Turkish occupation of eastern Europe—had an illustration in the Yamen of Ningpo. They were of the seed from which had come the harvest of terror, conquest, and rapine. The soldiers whose bearing and drill excited the wonder of an American admiral were of the race which had marched from Peking to the Danube. Behind them were over four hundred millions. The admiral felt the presence of a military power that could well become greater than that of combined Europe—of a power which, unlike that of Europe, was dis-

turbed neither by dynastic troubles nor the abrasions of contending races, but homogeneous, docile, brave, with the same religion, manners, and customs, serving the one master, not with that perfunctory sentiment in some countries called loyalty to a flag, and in others loyalty to a family, but serving him as a master, sacred, supreme, to them the Lord of the universe, the very Son of Heaven.

Truly, as Mr. Delane said, "The coming question will be Asiatic. It belongs to the next generation." "It may be that the oldest and the youngest of civilizations, face to face, America and China, will settle it, or it may come in some other form." Come it will! And no one could have stood in that quadrangle at Ningpo without feeling that again, as before, Europe might anticipate from Asia another of those movements which have changed the face of empires and menaced the dignity of civilization.

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE YACHT.

BY LEWIS HERRESHOFF.

About ten years ago it became painfully evident to the American yachtsman that the style of craft then in general use was not the best form for speed or for desirable qualities of safety and reliability in manœuvring.

It is true that "the skimming-dish" had served and still serves an excellent purpose, for it fills local demands that no other style of vessel will answer, namely, in navigating shallow bays and inlets that may be found on our coast, from which the deeper yacht would be wholly barred.

It must also be said in favor of the old American type of yacht that its first cost was not more than half of the present lead-laden structure, and had the recently-adopted form been earlier in style, many would have been constrained to forego the pleasures and healthful recreation of yachting. It may be said in excuse of the general use of a class of vessel now thought undesirable (in addition to low cost) that the large deck and roomy cabin afforded gave a degree of comfort not found in later designs, and the remarkable infrequency of stormy weather and rough water on our entire coast during the yachting season allured our yachtsmen into the prolonged use of a style of vessel now known to be in essential qualities vastly inferior.

In England, yacht-designing has developed under wholly different conditions both as to the state of the surrounding water and the rules governing the classification of yachts in racing; there "beam" has been heavily taxed, while here no restriction has been placed on the width of our racing craft.

Stormy, rough seas wash the coast of the British Isles, and but a small expanse of really inland protected waters can be found that afford sufficient sailing or cruising ground.

The result, then, has been that the forms of yachts in England and America became as unlike as the conditions by which they are surrounded. In the following table the general dimensions of the extreme type of two English and two American yachts are compared; and this also shows the difficulty of classification of English and American yachts for racing, and, indeed, of any comparison of desirable qualities:

	Designer.	Length over all.	Breadth.
		W. L.	Draught.
"Fannie"	Richmond	72′ 8″	23′ 3″
	1874.	66′ 7″	6′ 0″
"Tara"	J. Beavor-Webb		11′ 6″
		66′ 02″	12′ 0″
"Chittywee"	J. Ash		4′ 9″
	1882.	31′ 5″	7′ 0″
"Climax"	Wheeler	26′ 3″	13′ 0″
		26′ 2″	2′ 6″

The performances of the English cutter "Madge" in our waters brought the first realization of the fact that we were on the wrong track. The cutter "Clara," also from England, repeated and emphasized the work of the "Madge," so that when the "Genesta" challenged for the famous Queen's cup, it appeared very probable that she might carry it home.

At this juncture Burgess appeared, and saved our reputation in yachting circles by the splendid work of his "Puritan"; and when her performance was repeated by his "Mayflower," the tide of new designing set in, and the success of the compromise model was assured; and when the "Volunteer" defeated the "Thistle" it was recognized to be the most remarkable feat in the history of yachting.

In the new type of yacht, which, after our successes in the three great international contests, was a "compromise" between the American and English design, are combined what are believed to be the best in each—a measure of the extreme depth of the foreign craft and the modified beam of the native yacht.

In the three years following the success of the "Volunteer," the 30- and latterly the 40-foot class were thoroughly exploited in a struggle to beat the "Minerva," the finest type of English cutter that ever visited our shores. She proved well-nigh invincible, but at last Burgess with his "Gossoon" broke the spell, and the "Minerva" was finally beaten. The current year,

however, has witnessed the climax of yacht-designing in the magnificent class of 46-footers, which have awakened more general and deserved interest than any equal number of craft have ever aroused either at home or abroad.

The interest in this class has been intense from its very conception, and as keel after keel was laid down, adding a new member to the number, speculation began to be heard on all sides as to the probable chances of winning.

Of the eight yachts added to the 46-foot class during the current year, four were designed by Burgess, and one each by Paine, of Boston, Herreshoff, of Rhode Island, Winteringham, of Brooklyn, and Fife, of Scotland. For the most part they possess no marked difference in general proportions, and as a rule adhere to old lines, presenting but slight modifications of form from the most successful boats of recent construction.

The centreboard, always considered an essential adjunct in an American racing craft, has nearly disappeared in this class of racers; but one yacht can boast of the honor, if honor it be, of perpetuating the old custom. But it must be said in her praise that she stands either second or third in her class, and so far the vexed question of which is the better for speed, a keel or a centreboard, is unanswered.

The centreboard possesses the inalienable advantage, which it always will continue to hold, of materially lessening the draught of water of the vessel that employs it. Were the same proportional depth found in the keel 46-footers as in yachts of the 90-foot class, their draught of water would be so abnormally great that they would be practically shut out of most of our popular harbors. It is thought, then, wise practice to retain the use of the centreboard in yachts of the largest class. In making a just comparison between the keel and the centreboard, it must be admitted that the form of keel now in use on the deeper-draught boats is so disposed in relation to the body of the vessel as to closely resemble a centreboard; in fact, the keel yacht of the most approved design has in effect a centreboard fixed in position and forming a part of the construction of the hull.

Nearly all the yachts built recently for racing have shown on the part of their designers too great a tendency towards the employment of abnormal power; that is, too much lead below and too much canvas above. They nearly all come too closely to the

appellation of "brute"—a justly-applied term, and very properly one of reproach. That design is most commendable which renders a given duty with the employment of a minimum of power. Power is a costly factor; it means a greater prime cost and increased expense of maintenance, less durability in hull and rigging, and, in the main, a want of seaworthy qualities.

The Paine production is further removed from success than any one of her sisters, mostly by reason of too great power and consequent difficulties in construction of hull and adjustment of rigging. The yacht "Gloriana," designed and built by N. G. Herreshoff, of Bristol, R. I., has attracted from the earliest stages of her construction the deepest interest among yachting circles in America, and a share of English comment has been bestowed upon her. Native comment was divided, and foreign condemnatory in its character.

The cause of this unusual degree of interest is found in the fact that the "Gloriana" presents a decided departure in form from rival members of the 46-foot class, and, indeed, from any recorded previous construction (save the craft that her designer built and tested in the latter part of 1890), and, judging by her performances in New York in June and at Newport in August, it must be admitted that a new vein has been struck in naval architecture, and one that must have its effect on future designing.

In general proportions (save length on deck) and size of sail-spread, the "Gloriana" holds a middle position in her class; her draught of water also is about the same as that of her sisters, and in shape her sails are somewhat lower and wider than the others. Therefore the difference between her and the rest of her class can be explained only by the peculiar lines of her hull, to describe which will be here attempted; but to set forth in words what comes within the rightful domain of drawing is not easy, and the patience of the reader is solicited.

The most apparent difference in the form of the "Gloriana," when compared with other yachts, is her abnormal overhang at both bow and stern, her length over all being 70 feet, and on the water-line 45 feet 4 inches, giving her a very marked character and a singular profile. Her unusual overhang is an unavoidable consequence of the elongation of the body, or bilge, of the yacht, by which she gains ability to carry weight of lead ballast and press of sail. Were we to examine the model of a yacht of the usual type,

we would find that the body, or bilge, comes to a gradual end near the bow, which part of the model is made fine and sharp so as to insure an easy entrance, while the bilge at the forward part of the hull is quite full above the water. At the water-line the form of the vessel is a long, easy curve, so that, so long as the vessel remains in an upright position and does not pitch or bury the bows, her entrance is as easily performed as is possible; but when by press of sail the vessel careens, or when she is met by waves that make her bury the bows more or less deeply, then lines more or less abrupt and full are made to form a part of the entrance of the hull. Such contact with wave after wave soon diminishes essentially the speed of the yacht, often to a very serious degree.

This unavoidable diminution of speed through bringing full lines in contact with water during pitching is exactly what the form of the "Gloriana" is specially designed to counteract. If an observer were to examine her model, he would see that the body extends the entire length of the hull. From the extreme end of the overhang forward to the end of her finely tapered stern, there is no visible part above water that appears to correspond to the entrance of the common type of model; yet below water her lines are easy and sharp to a degree. Where the fulness of the bilge rises from the water near the bow and reaches forward to the extreme point of the overhang, the water-line seems full when compared to the entrance of other yachts, and the casual observer might reasonably think that such an entrance would move with difficulty through the water; but were he to watch closely the course of the displaced water when the vessel is under way, the mystery of her motion would be in a measure revealed.

It is true that the "Gloriana" makes a fuss around her bows when in motion, but it is of a wholly different character from that of other-formed vessels, the surface of the surrounding water seeming to roll over and disappear beneath the flare of her full-lined bow. Close examination also shows that the wave which is rolled outward is not a solid mass, nor is it raised considerably in height above the surface of the surrounding water; and since the resulting waves thrown off by her passage are few in number and small in size, the fact of easy movement is absolutely verified.

The usual form of bow resembles a sharp wedge with nearly

vertical sides that push the water aside in a large wave, while the "Gloriana's" bow is a more bluff wedge, having greatly inclined or flaring sides, and seems to dispose of the water displaced by the hull in a manner that makes but little disturbance of the surface.

As the "Gloriana" careens there is a slight lengthening of her immersed body, which aids in speed-giving, but her increase of length at such times is far less than is popularly supposed; it is not more than two or three feet in fairly smooth water, but in rough water, at intervals and for short periods, a greater length of her overhang at both bow and stern is utilized.

Pitching and diving with the "Gloriana" are performed far differently from the usual way. Owing to the buoyant nature of her overhang she does not dive into the waves as deeply as is usual, and, as has been before stated, she immerses, when diving and pitching, lines that are no fuller than those when progress in smooth water is made. The effect is that the surface of the water is far less disturbed by her passage, resulting in not only well-maintained higher speed, but in far drier decks than one would find on board yachts of the common form. During the race of the New York Yacht Club in June last the hatches of a schooner yacht having a water-line length double that of the "Gloriana" were washed off, while the decks of the "Gloriana" were wet only by spray: not once did she take over solid (green) water.

Another most valuable quality resulting from this newly-devised form is the ease and certainty that are given to the action of the rudder, which result is reached in a rather obscure but interesting manner. All yachtsmen familiar with the working of wide vessels of our old type recognize the difficulty of steering when the yacht is reaching or sailing free from the wind; at such times it is often necessary to have recourse to mechanical aid, in spite of which it is no unusual thing to lose control of the vessel temporarily.

In vessels of the usual form, when driven by fresh winds, the water is piled up against the lee bow, and owing to the bluff part of the bilge being wholly or partly immersed, the water it displaces forces the bow of the boat strongly to windward, giving the vessel a tendency to "luff," or turn toward the wind.

This "luffing" influence of the lee bow must be counteracted by the rudder, resulting in labor for the helmsman and loss of

speed from a double reason—the obstruction caused by the piling-up of the water of displacement under the lee bow, and the drag on the boat by the rudder, seeing that it must be carried at an abnormal angle to produce the required effect.

In the "Gloriana" there is no such influence under the lee bow, or at most a greatly lessened one, the water of displacement being disposed of in such a manner that it does not push the bow to windward; and at all points of sailing, running, reaching, or close windward work, she is guided with the utmost ease, answering quickly to the slightest motion of the tiller, even though her lee rail be "awash" when reaching with a wind of twenty-four miles an hour.

The increased deck room afforded by the long overhang is a factor of great value in the management of a vessel; the bowsprit need not be so long nor the boom project so far over the stern, thus giving more easy access to outlying portions of the sails in the operations of reefing, changing, or furling.

A very snug but practicable cruising rig for ocean work could be set within the length of the deck-line, omitting wholly the use of the bowsprit; an advantage of unquestionable value in stormy seas.

Beside the means of healthy recreation that yachting affords, it has a value in schooling youth in the manly art of navigation, and, greater than all, it furnishes means of experiment to test the real value of diverse models and rigs. The present perfection of the world's naval and merchant marine is without doubt a direct outgrowth of experiences gained in the construction and handling of yachts.

The new departure as embodied in the "Gloriana" is of such a character that many desirable qualities are given to the vessel besides an evident increase of speed; the form of the "Gloriana" affords a greater degree of seaworthiness and increased capacity to carry cargo, to which may be added many lesser advantages.

Since it has become an established fact that human ends are better served by the use of steam in the navigation of the great oceans as well as lesser waters, the question follows naturally, Do the principles involved in the design of the "Gloriana" apply in any degree to the requirements of steamships for naval or merchant service on the ocean, or to a steamer intended for coastwise or inland-water use? It may be answered that all her special points

would be of value in steam navigation in greater or less degree, and their adoption would be easy, adding little to first cost and nothing to maintenance.

It is demonstrated beyond doubt that in most conditions of sea a vessel having the model of the "Gloriana" would attain given results of speed with less power, which means the consumption of less coal; and if even a slight saving could be effected it would be an immense advantage, for the amount of coal now used in the new transatlantic steamers that perform the trip in less than six days is appalling. In the best forms of marine engines now in practice a daily consumption of 40,000 pounds of coal for a development of 1,000 indicated horse-power is required, and when, as in case of the large ships now in use, 15,000 to 18,000 indicated horse-power is required, it can easily be seen how desirable even a slight saving of coal would be. The same conditions that attend the pitching and diving of a vessel of the "Gloriana" type would be of prime importance to a steamer navigating stormy seas; higher speed could be maintained under such conditions, and drier decks would also result, thus affording a greater degree of comfort and safety to the passengers and crew. Owing to the elongation of the body of the vessel, a greater carrying capacity could be realized, and even in a part of the overhang some classes of freight might be carried.

The overhang could be objectionable only when in dock, by requiring more space, but at sea there is plenty of room for any degree of prolongation, and by the placing of suitable bulkheads at or near the usual water-line, the overhang would serve as an element of safety in collision with ship or ice, by protecting the immersed part of the hull in a more effectual manner than can be possible with the common form of bow and arrangement of bulkheads.

A steamship designed with a "Gloriana" bow would not present so strong an objection to turning as the deep, wall-sided bows of a usually-modelled vessel. She would not pile up a wave on the side towards which the ship is turning; thus affording far better control of the ship by giving ability to turn in a smaller circle than is now common. Many accidents have been caused by the sluggish manner in which steamships answer their helms.

Let us hope that a steam vessel embodying the "Gloriana" principles will soon be built, so that the widest scope may be given

to any improved design calculated to benefit the condition of those who journey by sea or follow it as a vocation, and the functions of trade promoted by the use of safe, speedy ships with a maximum of carrying capacity.

The subject of yacht-designing cannot be complete without some tribute to the great designer, Burgess, whose recent untimely death is deeply regretted in every circle where yachting is known and naval architecture studied. He entered the field of designing at a period when the science was at the lowest ebb, when the failure of our old type of yachts began to be recognized; he gave it his study, thought, and skill, and left it on a well-established foundation with his brilliant successes in the defence of the Queen's cup and his splendid contributions to our yachting fleet, which together stand as a noble monument to his memory. He died at the zenith of his success, the pride of his countrymen and in fullest honor and confidence of all yachtsmen.

Too much cannot be done by those who are interested in the progress of designing as applied to yachts, as well as all marine constructions, to foster the spirit of international contests for friendly supremacy.

The modification of design for yachts on both sides of the Atlantic during the last decade has been amazing, and now that the best designers are working more in accord as to rules that govern the conduct and classification of yachts in races, it is to be hoped that even more rapid improvement will be made in the near future. The following table shows how nearly the general proportions of the newest yachts coincide, the examples being taken from well-known designers in England and America:

	Designer.	Length over all.	Breadth.
		W. L.	Draught.
"Oweene"	Burgess	62′ 0″	13′ 4″
	1891.	45′ 9″	11′ 3″
"Barbara"	Fife	63′ 0″	13′ 0″
	1891.	45′ 9″	11′ 8″
"Gloriana"	Herreshoff	70′ 0″	13′ 2″
	1891.	45′ 4″	11′ 2″
"Dragon"	Fife	.....	10′ 3″
	1889.	45′ 6″	8′ 4″

At the foundation of international contests lies the Queen's cup. To it a debt is owed by naval science of incalculable value. It has done more than scores of industrious designers

could do if they studied their own work only and compared it with similar types. And from this famous trophy we still look for further influence in designing, and in the development of thought and practice in the noble art of naval construction.

If the conditions that surround the tenure of this wonderful cup be not such as to promote friendly international rivalry, then let the duty and wish of every spirited American yachtsman be to modify the "deed of gift" so that soon our transatlantic friends may visit us again, and stir us to yet better and higher work.

Let us place the cup within easy range of all the world, and if it be lost we shall have gained untold times its value in incentive to still greater improvement. But as we stand to-day as regards the Queen's cup, we can easily afford to be lenient, with a yacht like the "Gloriana" to defend it, and a corps of designers well attuned to the "high pitch" of the requirements of yacht-designing.

LEWIS HERRESHOFF.

DRUNKENNESS IS CURABLE.

BY JOHN FLAVEL MINES, LL. D.

On a cold, stormy day in early April I alighted from the cars, a thousand miles from home, and made my way through a shower of sleet to the bare and gloomy hotel of a little prairie village in Illinois. Banks of snow were still scattered about, but the rain that fell continually for the next two weeks swept them away, and under the pressure of the clouds the village seemed to sink more deeply every day into the thick black mud. In all my campaigning, including the late war, I had never had such a keen sense of desolation. I was weary of the place in an hour, and wondered what could have induced me to go there.

A modern Ponce de Leon, I had started on a voyage of discovery for the fountain of renewed youth and restored manhood, against the persuasion of friends who wished me to wait and see how others fared; in the teeth of physicians who told me that it was a deception and an old dream revamped; and in opposition to the arguments of the medical superintendent of a fashionable "home" that fronts the waters of New York Harbor, who insisted that I would be throwing away my money. To my friends I replied that I could not wait an hour while there was a chance held out to hope. To the doctors I said nothing, knowing how physicians disagree. To the superintendent I answered: "You tell me now that I am the only person who can help myself in this matter; if you had only told me this frankly the first day I met you, I would have saved the money paid to your institution." So I went my way alone, without faith, but with a tiny spark of hope kindled in my breast, not knowing what would befall me at Dwight. What I saw, heard, and experienced there is the best of all arguments for the treatment of the alcoholic appetite as a disease and for belief in its cure.

For twenty years I had been a victim to the disease of drink. It seized me at odd times, usually the most inopportune, and in spite of all my struggles would gain the temporary mastery. Months of peace might pass, but suddenly the fever would break loose and run riot in my veins, and I knew then that it must have its course. I have as much will-power as the next man, but my will was a straw in the grasp of this horror. Men who have not felt the clutch of drink as it sweeps through and possesses the whole system, have no conception of the agony of the struggle which the victim makes. There are no grander heroes under God's sunlight than the men who honestly fight against drink. I had battled for years, had gone voluntarily into exile in homes and asylums to escape my enemy, and only in late years recognized the fact that drunkenness was a disease, increased no doubt by indulgence, but for which a man was no more responsible than for a fever he had caught by exposure. I regret the disease. It has brought sorrow and loss to me for the years of my life that should have been most prospered. But it has not been the unalloyed curse that fanatics would persuade man to believe. Out of my sufferings the pictures drawn by Felix Oldboy have been wrought, and through struggles as fierce as death and blackness that was despair have come gleams of the sunshine of memory, painting the quiet old home in which the little lad sat by the side of his grandmother and her cat. If the present had been prosperous, I should not have carried my life into memories of the past. And so, as I believe, God sends compensation for the battle he gives each one of us to fight.

It was because I had found no permanent benefit from seclusion in an asylum or home, but rather the contrary, because I fretted against restraint that could be of no use to a periodical drinker, that I was ready to give a fair trial to the promise made me by Dr. Leslie E. Keeley, of Dwight, that he would guarantee me a cure for my disease. I told him that for more than two months my life had been one of entire sobriety, and asked him if he would undertake my cure under these circumstances. He replied that he would. It was something of an assurance to find that his experience of thirty years as a medical man, and for twenty years as a specialist in alcoholism, coincided with my experience as a sufferer. His ideas were common-sense. My own diagnosis told me that my trouble was a disease, and I felt that

it was an insult to medical science to suppose for a moment that no remedy could be found for it. I recalled my own experience with chills and fever. One autumn day in 1848 my stepmother asked me why I did not keep my teeth still. I told her that "I could not help it." It was a chill, and a violent fever followed. This took place in our home on St. John's Park in this city. Afterwards I had chills at school, in college, in the army, and at last, in May, 1868, on the very first day I took charge of a daily newspaper as managing editor, I had a chill, and then the attacks came on every day. I had taken quinine for twenty years, and was weary of it. So I went to a distinguished homœopathic physician in Albany, an old friend of my father, and asked him if he could eradicate the disease. He promised to do so if I would strictly obey his orders and not stop taking medicine until he said so. I promised, and for three months took his powders of arsenic and copper. Twenty-three years have passed and I have not had a touch of the disease since.

I mention this because dipsomania affected me in precisely the same manner. It came on at the most inopportune times, and apparently without cause. Friends never had anything to do with my drinking. I always had will-power enough to say 'No" when the fever was not in my veins. When the attack came on, they could not keep me from indulgence in drink, for appetite was stronger than their will and mine too. Senseless people would ask: "Why do you drink?" I said always: "Because I cannot help it." That was the true reason and the exact state of the case. Foolish folk would go farther and say: "Look at me; I don't drink." As well might one say to a man whose face is scarred with the small-pox: "Why did you have the loathsome disease? Look at me; I never had it." Dr. Keeley treated me for dipsomania after the same fashion that the physician at Albany had followed. That Dr. Keeley is an allopathic physician made no difference to me, for I have none of the current prejudice about schools of medicine. He laid down the laws that I must follow, the time that I must stay, and insisted, as he does in all cases, on unqualified obedience while in his hands. But he gained my confidence not only by his diagnosis, but from the fact that he had brushed away at the start the musty, superstitious old cobwebs of bolts, bars, and restraints. The Keeley Institute was, and is, only an

office to which patients go for treatment and medicine. There are not even official boarding-places. The patient selects his hotel (there is a fine new one there now) or his boarding-place according to his taste and means, and is free to select his own company and amusements and to occupy his spare time as he sees fit. When I went to Dwight there were barely one hundred patients. When I left, at the end of six weeks, there were two hundred and forty under treatment. Now the number has reached five hundred. My comrades were lawyers, physicians, editors, merchants, three judges, the attorney-general of one of the new States at the West, an ex-Congressman, and an assorted lot of half a dozen State senators. Without exception they were the brightest body of men I ever met, and to say that they could meet and exchange views daily, without interference and restraint, and yet be made the victims of a fraud, is an insult to common-sense. There was no concealment, no jugglery, no suave or deceptive talk, but the simple medical treatment of our disease. As for me, it was a revelation to find that my manhood was respected from the outset, and that not only were there no school-boy "bounds" for our walks, but that in that primitive community the town marshal, with whom I lodged, never locked his front door at night.

The patient's first visit is paid to the office of Dr. Keeley, where his case is stated and where he receives a hypodermic injection in the upper left arm, and there is given to him a bottle of the bichloride-of-gold mixture, a dose of which is to be taken every two hours while awake. The hypodermic, called in Dwight the "shot," is the supporting medicine, which sustains the frame under treatment. Its preparation, and the form in which the bichloride of gold is made up for its special purpose, are Dr. Keeley's secret, and it is manifestly absurd for those not in the secret to pretend to criticise it. The treatment is administered four times a day, at 8 A.M., 12 noon, 5 P.M. and 7:30 P.M., and for three or four weeks usually, though sometimes a week or two longer, according to the personal diagnosis made by the doctor from day to day. If a new arrival needs whiskey, it is given to him in a bottle, and he can have more until his palate loathes it and he returns his unopened bottle to the doctor. From this point the work of his physical reconstruction begins. He finds that the treatment is not a mere tonic, as some have supposed. Sometimes his eyesight is affected, but only for a few days; in

some cases the memory is temporarily weakened ; in every case he becomes conscious of a feeling of lassitude and indifference to the outside world, as the gold searches into the weaker parts of his frame, and purifies and builds them up into new strength. Nor is this all. The treatment at Dwight removes such physical ills as are caused directly by drink. Dr. Keeley's programme promised this, but I had scarcely been able to credit it. As a matter of fact, I found myself relieved of twenty pounds of superfluous flesh, and am the better for it. Another patient, a native of this city, a relative of America's greatest prose-writer and bearing his name, came to Dwight on crutches, while I was there, suffering from partial paralysis caused by drink. In ten days his crutches were abandoned, and in four weeks he went away sound of frame, and with new life in his body and fresh hope in his heart.

The physical experience varies in different cases, but to each there comes at last a time when the patient discovers that all weakness and depression have vanished, and that the fetters of old appetites and habits have fallen away from him, and when he steps out of the darkness of the wilderness into the full light of day and knows that once more he has a man's strength to do a man's work among men. My own experience was somewhat rare, because I went to Dwight free from any direct effects of alcohol. I experienced no loss of memory or defection of eyesight, but after a week had passed I felt that if I had been anywhere else I would have had a return of the periodical appetite, and might have yielded to it because of my depression. I remember the terror this feeling gave me. As I stood in line, I said to Dr. Keeley: "I am glad that I came at this time. I think I have hit one of my periodical attacks, for I feel so blue and wretched that if I were in New York I should yield and drink." "And the boy," inquired the doctor, looking searchingly at me ; "you wouldn't leave him ?" "Of course not," I said ; "I do not intend to drink, but I thought it right to tell you the symptoms." He bade me wait until the line of patients had gone through their treatment, then took me into his own office, poured out nearly half a tumbler of whiskey, with a little water added, and said: "Drink it." "What is it ?" I asked. "No matter," was the reply ; "drink it." I drank half of it and said: "Why, it's whiskey." "Drink it all," said Dr. Keeley. "When you need whis-

key, I would as readily give you that as anything else." I drank, went to dinner, went walking in the afternoon, and never thought of it again until I went back to the office at the regular hour. Nor did I want any more, nor want to take the two-ounce bottle of whiskey which was handed me at noon next day with injunctions to take the dose in about twenty minutes. That was the end of my drinking, and all that has passed my lips since the 31st day of January. Formerly a drink of whiskey would have set my brain on fire, and in an hour's time I would have walked ten miles to get the second one, and had it at all hazards. When I saw that it had ceased to make me its victim and slave, I could have cried for joy. I knew from that moment that the bichloride of gold had gotten the upper hand, broken the fetters of disease, and made me whole. Yet I was not entirely out of the woods. When this hour of temporary temptation had gone by, I passed through such an experience as is apt to follow a prolonged debauch, and for two weeks could scarcely eat or sleep. Then, suddenly, as if I had stepped out of the blackness of an African jungle into the quiet sunshine of Central Park, I broke out of my living tomb and knew that I was cured. The knowledge came to me like a benediction from heaven.

I had taken with me, for company, my son, a little lad who had not quite reached his sixteenth birthday, and who, as "Master Felix," is known to thousands who have never seen him. He saw and heard everything at Dwight. The stake was a large one to him, and he watched the process anxiously. When we came away, life had a new meaning for us both. He has had a happy summer, for he has never doubted, and has never had a fear, whether I was with him or absent. To him, as to me, the memory of that handful of white houses set among stately cottonwoods on the prairie, will always come up steeped with the fragrance of the May blossoms that first taught hope, and then impressed faith in the work that was doing.

Master Felix knew every patient there, and studied them all without prejudices. Elected an honorary member of the Bichloride of Gold Club, to which I had also been elected, he attended every meeting, and by a gift of books laid the foundation of the club library which was called by his name. His companions there and mine were Mr. Opie Read, editor of *The Arkansaw Traveller*, ex-Congressman Tarsney, of Michigan, George Work, of New

York, Judge J. D. Thayer, of Warsaw, Ind., State Senator Rust, of Wisconsin, Captain Robert Ayres, late of the United States Army, a graduate of West Point and a veteran of the war, and many others who have given me permission to use their names, and who are sound and enthusiastic in the faith. They are all members of the Bichloride of Gold Club, at Dwight, a voluntary association of patients and graduates of the Keeley Institute, intended, like other clubs, for the convenience and benefit of its members. The number of its members enrolled in the books up to August 27 was 850, and of this total only six had come under discipline and had their names stricken from the rolls. Dr. Keeley guarantees a cure of 95 per cent. of his patients. The club keeps a paternal and watchful eye on all who go out from under its roof, and it reports a loss of less than 1 per cent. Those are from the ranks of men sent there unwillingly by parents or guardians, and in no case of men who voluntarily sought freedom from disease.

No one who has not been similarly cursed with the disease of drink can know the joy of the moment in which my cure came to me as a fact. I do not believe, I know, that I am cured, and am satisfied as to its permanency. I did not doubt twenty years ago that I was cured of the chills and fever; I did not doubt, when this last May came around with its blossoms of spring, that my cure was permanent, and that the appetite for drink was eradicated. I do not understand the processes, but I know the fact. Said Mr. George Work, of this city, who was one of my companions at Dwight, "I tell my friends that all I know about it is that I went to Dwight, and there Dr. Keeley cured me"; and as he said this I thought unconsciously of the blind man by the pool of Siloam, and his reply to the doubters who gathered around and tormented him. To all of us who suffered and have been healed it is a resurrection. As I passed along the streets a year ago, and was greeted by my friends, I knew that they looked upon me as a slave to habit. They knew how well I had fought, but they had no belief in my final victory. However strong and healthy I might appear at the time, they looked on me as doomed. I felt it and could see the pity in their eyes. I always moved among them as the gladiator of old Rome who, with the blue sky of Italia over his head, Cæsar before his face, and a shouting multitude surrounding him, knew that whatever

temporary triumphs he might win, the white sands at his feet would one day drink his blood. Always, as I walked among my fellows, the words of doom came to my lips, "Morituri te salutamus." To-day I meet my fellow man with open gaze, knowing that I have conquered the black lion of the desert; and my sense of freedom and happiness no man can paint.

The city of New York receives the sum of $1,468,130 from license fees, or, as I might put it, for the privilege of making drunkards. Not one dollar of this money is expended for the purpose of saving the victims of drink. Is there anything in the facts that I have made known, to suggest that the city of my love, and to which I have devoted the best powers of my pen, has a duty to do in this matter?

JOHN FLAVEL MINES.
(FELIX OLDBOY.)

HAÏTI AND THE UNITED STATES.

INSIDE HISTORY OF THE NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE MÔLE ST. NICOLAS.

BY THE HON. FREDERICK DOUGLASS, LATE UNITED STATES MINISTER TO HAITI.

II.

At a meeting subsequent to the one already described, application for a United States naval station at the Môle St. Nicolas was made in due form to Mr. Firmin, the Haïtien Minister of Foreign Affairs. At his request, as already stated, this application was presented to him in writing. The paper containing it is somewhat remarkable. It was prepared on board of the "Philadelphia," the flagship of Rear-Admiral Bancroft Gherardi, and bore his signature alone. I neither signed it nor was asked to sign it, although it met my entire approval. I make this statement not in the way of a complaint or grievance, but simply to show what, at that time, was my part, and what was not my part, in this important negotiation, the failure of which has been unjustly laid to my charge. Had the Môle been then acquired, in response to this paper, the credit of success, according to the record, would have properly belonged to the gallant admiral in whose name it was demanded, for in it I had neither part nor lot.

At this point, curiously enough, and unfortunately for the negotiations, the Haïtien Minister, who is an able man and well skilled in the technicalities of diplomacy, asked to see the commission of Admiral Gherardi and to read his letter of instructions. When these were presented to Mr. Firmin, he, after carefully reading them, pronounced them insufficient, and held that by them the government of the United States would not be bound by any convention which Haïti might make with the admiral. This position of Mr. Firmin's was earnestly and stoutly opposed by

Admiral Gherardi, who insisted that his instructions were full, complete, and amply sufficient. Unfortunately, however, he did not leave the matter in controversy without intimating that he thought that Mr. Firmin might be insincere in raising such an objection, and that he was urging it simply with a view to cause unnecessary delay. This was more like the blunt admiral than the discreet diplomat. Such an imputation was obviously out of place, and not likely to smooth the way to a successful proceeding, but quite the reverse. Mr. Firmin insisted that his ground was well and honestly taken.

Here, therefore, the negotiation was brought to a sudden halt, and the question for us then was, What shall be done next? Three ways were open to us. First, to continue to insist upon the completeness of the authority of Admiral Gherardi; second, to abandon the scheme of a naval station altogether; third, to apply to the government at Washington for the required letter of credence. It was my opinion that it was hardly worth while to continue to insist upon the sufficiency of the admiral's papers, since it seemed useless to contend about mere technicalities; more especially as we were now in telegraphic connection with the United States, and could in the course of a few days easily obtain the proper and required papers.

Besides, I held that a prompt compliance with the demand of the Haïtien Government for a perfect letter of credence would be not only the easiest way out of the difficulty, but the wisest policy by which to accomplish the end we sought, since such compliance on our part with even what might fairly be considered an unreasonable demand would make refusal by Haïti to grant the Môle all the more difficult.

I did not understand Admiral Gherardi to combat this opinion of mine, for he at once acted upon it, and caused an officer from his flagship to go with me to my house and prepare a telegram to be sent to Washington for the required letter of credence. To this telegram he, two days thereafter, received answer that such a letter would be immediately sent by a Clyde steamer to Gonaïves, and thither the admiral went to receive his expected letter. But, from some unexplained cause, no such letter came by the Clyde steamer at the time appointed, and two months intervened before the desired credentials arrived. This unexpected delay proved to be very mischievous and unfavorable to our getting the

Môle, since it gave rise among the Haïtien people to much speculation and many disquieting rumors prejudicial to the project. It was said that Admiral Gherardi had left Port au Prince in anger, and had gone to take possession of the Môle without further parley; that the American flag was already floating over our new naval station; that the United States wanted the Môle as an entering wedge to obtaining possession of the whole island; with much else of like inflammatory nature. Although there was no truth in all this, it had the unhappy effect among the masses of stirring up suspicion and angry feelings towards the United States, and of making it more difficult than it might otherwise have been for the government of Haïti to grant the required concession.

Finally, after this long interval of waiting, during which the flagship of Admiral Gherardi was reported at different points, sometimes at Gonaïves, sometimes at the Môle, and sometimes at Kingston, Jamaica, the required letter of credence arrived. The next day I was again summoned on board the "Philadelphia," and there was shown me a paper, signed by the President of the United States and by the Secretary of State, authorizing myself, as minister resident to Haïti, and Rear-Admiral Gherardi, as special commissioner, to negotiate with such persons as Haïti might appoint for the purpose of concluding a convention by which we should obtain a lease of the Môle St. Nicolas as a United States naval station.

It may here be remarked that the letter of credence signed by President Harrison and by the Secretary of State differed in two respects from the former and rejected letter under which we had previously acted. First, it charged me, equally with Admiral Gherardi, with the duty of negotiation; and secondly, it was an application for a naval station pure and simple, without limitations and without conditions.

Before presenting to Haïti this new letter, which had the advantage of being free from the conditions specified in the old one, the question arose between the admiral and myself as to whether or not we should begin our new negotiations, under our new commission, separate and entirely apart from all that had been attempted under the instructions contained in the old letter. On this point I differed with the admiral. I took the position that we should ignore the past altogether, and proceed according to

the instructions of the new letter alone, unincumbered by any terms or limitations contained in the old letter. I felt sure that there were features in the conditions of the old letter which would be met by the representatives of Haïti with strong objections. But the admiral and his able lieutenant insisted that the present letter did not exclude the conditions of the old one, but was, in its nature, only supplementary to them, and hence that this was simply a continuation of what had gone before. It was therefore decided to proceed with the negotiations on the basis of both the old and the new letter. Under the former letter of instructions our terms were precise and explicit; under the latter we were left largely to our own discretion: we were simply to secure from the government of Haïti a lease of the Môle St. Nicolas for a naval station.

The result is known. Haïti refused to grant the lease, and alleged that to do so was impossible under the hard terms imposed in the previous letter of instructions. I do not know that our government would have accepted a naval station from Haïti upon any other or less stringent terms or conditions than those exacted in our first letter of instructions; but I do know that the main grounds alleged by Haïti for its refusal were the conditions set forth in this first letter of instructions, one of which is expressed as follows: "That so long as the United States may be the lessee of the Môle St. Nicolas, the government of Haïti will not lease or otherwise dispose of any port or harbor or other territory in its dominions, or grant any special privileges or rights of use therein, to any other power, state, or government." This was not only a comprehensive limitation of the power of Haïti over her own territory, but a denial to all others of that which we claimed for ourselves.

But no one cause fully explains our failure to get a naval station at the Môle. One fundamental element in our non-success was found, not in any aversion to the United States or in any indifference on my part, as has been often charged, but in the government of Haïti itself. It was evidently timid. With every disposition to oblige us, it had not the courage to defy the well-known, deeply-rooted, and easily-excited prejudices and traditions of the Haïtien people. Nothing is more repugnant to the thoughts and feelings of the masses of that country than the alienation of a single rood of their territory to a foreign power.

This sentiment originated, very naturally, in the circumstances in which Haïti began her national existence. The whole Christian world was at that time against her. The Caribbean Sea was studded with communities hostile to her. They were slaveholding. She, by her bravery and her blood, was free. Her existence was, therefore, a menace to them, and theirs was a menace to her. France, England, Spain, Portugal, and Holland, as well as the United States, were wedded to the slave system which Haïti had, by arms, thrown off ; and hence she was regarded as an outcast, and was outlawed by the Christian world. Though time and events have gone far to change this relation of hers to the outside world, the sentiment that originated in the beginning of her existence continues, on both sides, until this day. It was this that stood like a wall of granite against our success. Other causes coöperated, but this was the principal cause. Of course our peculiar and intense prejudice against the colored race was not forgotten. Our contrast to other nations, in this respect, is often dwelt upon in Haïti to our disadvantage. In no part of Europe will a Haïtien be insulted because of his color, and Haïtiens well know that this is not the case in the United States.

Another influence unfavorable to our obtaining the coveted naval station at the Môle was the tone of the New York press on the subject. It more than hinted that, once in possession of the Môle, the United States would control the destiny of Haïti. Torn and rent by revolution as she has been and still is, Haïti yet has a large share of national pride, and scorns the idea that she needs, or will submit to, the rule of a foreign power. Some of her citizens would doubtless be glad of American rule, but the overwhelming majority would burn their towns and freely shed their blood over their ashes to prevent such a consummation.

Not the least, perhaps, among the collateral causes of our non-success was the minatory attitude assumed by us while conducting the negotiation. What wisdom was there in confronting Haïti at such a moment with a squadron of large ships of war with a hundred cannon and two thousand men ? This was done, and it was naturally construed into a hint to Haïti that if we could not, by appeals to reason and friendly feeling, obtain what we wanted, we could obtain it by a show of force. We appeared before the Haïtiens, and before the world, with the pen in one hand and the sword in the other. This was not a friendly and con-

siderate attitude for a great government like ours to assume when asking a concession from a small and weak nation like Haïti. It was ill timed, and out of all proportion to the demands of the occasion. It was also done under a total misapprehension of the character of the people with whom we had to deal. We should have known that, whatever else the Haïtien people may be, they are not cowards, and hence are not easily scared.

In the face of all these obvious and effective causes of failure, is it not strange that our intelligent editors and our nautical newspaper writers could not have found for the American Government and people a more rational cause for the failure of the negotiations for the Môle St. Nicolas than that of my color, indifference, and incompetency to deal with a question of such magnitude? Were I disposed to exchange the position of accused for that of accuser, I could find ample material to sustain me in that position. Other persons did much to create conditions unfavorable to our success, but I leave to their friends the employment of such personal assaults.

On the theory that I was the cause of this failure, we must assume that Haïti was willing to grant the Môle; that the timidity of the Haïtien Government was all right; that the American prejudice was all right; that the seven ships of war in the harbor of Port au Prince were all right; that Rear-Admiral Gherardi was all right, and that I alone was all wrong; and, moreover, that but for me the Môle St. Nicolas, like an over-ripe apple shaken by the wind, would have dropped softly into our national basket. I will not enlarge upon this absurd assumption, but will leave the bare statement of it to the intelligent reader, that it may perish by its flagrant contradiction of well-known facts and by its own absurdity.

I come now to another cause of complaint against me, scarcely less serious in the minds of those who now assail me than the charge of having defeated the lease of the Môle St. Nicolas; namely, the failure of what is publicly known as the Clyde contract. Soon after my arrival in Haïti I was put in communication with an individual calling himself the agent of the highly respectable mercantile firm of William P. Clyde & Co., of New York. He was endeavoring to obtain a subsidy of a half-million dollars from the government of Haïti to enable this firm to ply a line of steamers between New York and Haïti. From the first

this agent assumed toward me a dictatorial attitude. He claimed to be a native of South Carolina, and it was impossible for him to conceal his contempt for the people whose good will it was his duty to seek. Between this agent and the United States Government I found myself somewhat in the position of a servant between two masters: either one of them, separately and apart, might be served acceptably; but to serve both satisfactorily at the same time and place might be a difficult task, if not an impossible one. There were times when I was compelled to prefer the requirements of the one to the ardent wishes of the other, and I thought as between this agent and the United States I should choose to serve the latter.

The trouble between us came about in this way: Mr. Firmin, the Haïtien Minister of Foreign Affairs, had objected to granting the Clyde concession on the ground that, if it were granted and this heavy drain were made upon the treasury of his country, Mr. Douglass stood ready to present and to press upon Haïti the payment of the claims of many other American citizens, and that this would greatly embarrass the newly-organized government of President Hyppolite. In view of this objection, the zealous agent in question came to me and proposed that I should go to Mr. Firmin, in my quality of minister resident and consul-general of the United States, and assure him that, if he would only grant the Clyde concession, I, on my part, would withhold and refrain from pressing the claims of other American citizens.

The proposition shocked me. It sounded like the words of Satan on the mountain, and I thought it time to call a halt. I was in favor of the Clyde contract, but I could not see what I had said or done to make it possible for any man to make to me a proposal so plainly dishonest and scandalous. I refused to do any such thing. Here was my first offence, and it at once stamped me as an unprofitable servant. It did not seem to occur to this agent that he had made to me a shameful, dishonest, and shocking proposition. Blinded by zeal or by an influence still more misleading, he seemed to see in it only an innocent proposal. He thereafter looked upon me as an unworthy ally, and duly reported me as such to his master and to other influential persons. He could not understand my conduct as proceeding from other or better motives than that of over-affection for the Haïtiens. In his eyes I was, from that time, more a Haïtien than an

American, and I soon saw myself so characterized in American journals.

The refusal to compromise and postpone the just claims of other American citizens for that of his master's contract was not, however, my only offence. On obtaining a leave of absence from my post, in July, 1890, I, of course, as was my duty, called upon President Hyppolite before my departure for the purpose of paying to him my respects. This agent at once sought me and desired me to make use of this visit of mere ceremony as an occasion to press anew the Clyde contract upon the attention of the President. This I could not properly do, especially as I had on previous occasions repeatedly urged its consideration upon him. The President already knew well enough my sense of the importance to Haïti of this measure, not only as a means of enlarging her commerce and of promoting her civilization, but also as a guarantee of the stability of her government. Nevertheless, my refusal to urge in so unbecoming a manner a demand already repeatedly urged upon the attention of the Haïtien Government was made use of by this agent, to my injury, both at the State Department and with Mr. Clyde's firm. I was reported at Washington and to various persons in high places as unfriendly to this concession.

When at last it appeared to the agent that the government of Haïti was, as he thought, stubbornly blind to its own interests, and that it would not grant the contract in question, he called at the United States legation and expressed to me his disappointment and disgust at the delay of Haïti in accepting his scheme. He said he did not believe that the government really intended to do anything for his firm ; that he himself had spent much time and money in promoting the concession ; and as he did not think that Mr. Clyde ought to be made to pay for the time thus lost and the expense incurred by the delay and dallying of the Haïtien Government, he should therefore demand his pay of Haïti. This determination struck me as very odd, and I jocosely replied :

"Then, sir, as they will not allow you to put a hot poker down their backs, you mean to make them pay you for heating it!"

This rejoinder was my final destruction in the esteem of this zealous advocate. He saw at once that he could not count upon

my assistance in making this new demand. I was both surprised at his proposal and amused by it, and wondered that he could think it possible to get this pay. It seemed to me that Haïti would scout the idea at once. She had not sent for him. She had not asked him to stay. He was there for purposes of his own, and not for any purpose of hers. I could not see why Haïti should pay him for coming, going, or staying. But this gentleman knew better than I the generous character of the people with whom he had to deal, and he followed them up till they actually paid him $5,000 in gold.

But compliance with his demand proved a woful mistake on the part of Haïti, and, in fact, nonsense. This man, after getting his money, went away, but he did not stay away. He was soon back again to press his scheme with renewed vigor. His demands were now to be complied with or he would make, not Rome, but Haïti, howl. To him it was nothing that Haïti was already wasted by repeated revolutions; nothing that she was already staggering under the weight of a heavy national debt; nothing that she herself ought to be the best judge of her ability to pour out a half-million of dollars in this new and, to her, doubtful enterprise; nothing that she had heard his arguments in its favor a hundred times over; nothing that, in her judgment, she had far more pressing needs for her money than the proposed investment in this steamship subsidy, as recommended by him; nothing that she had told him plainly that she was afraid to add to her pecuniary burdens this new and onerous one; and nothing that she had just paid him $5,000 in gold to get rid of his importunities.

Now, while I was in favor of Haïti's granting the subsidy asked for in the name of Clyde & Co., and thought it would be in many ways a good thing for Haïti to have the proposed line of steamers for which a subsidy was asked, I had, and I now have, nothing but disgust for the method by which this scheme was pressed upon Haïti.

I must say in conclusion that, while, as already intimated, it does not appear certain that Haïti would have leased us the Môle on any conditions whatever, it is certain that the application for it was ill timed in more respects than one. It was especially unfortunate for us that the Clyde concession was applied for in advance of our application for a lease of the Môle. Whatever

else may be said of the Haïtiens, this is true of them: they are quick to detect a fault and to distinguish a trick from an honest proceeding. To them the preference given to the interests of an individual firm over those of the United States seemed to wear a sinister aspect. In the opinion of many intelligent persons in Haïti, had a lease of the Môle been asked for in advance of the concession to Mr. Clyde, the application for it might have been successful. This, however, is not my opinion. I do not now think that any earthly power outside of absolute force could have gotten for us a naval station at the Môle St. Nicolas. Still, to all appearances, the conditions of success were more favorable before than after the Clyde contract was urged upon Haïti. Prior to this the country, weary of war, was at peace. Ambitious leaders had not begun openly to conspire. The government under Hyppolite was newly organized. Confidence in its stability was unimpaired. It was, naturally enough, reaching out its hand to us for friendly recognition. Our good offices during the war were fresh in its memory. France, England, and Germany were not ready to give it recognition. In fact, all the conditions conspired to influence Haïti to listen to our request for a coaling-station at the Môle St. Nicolas. But instead of a proposition for a much-needed coaling-station at the Môle St. Nicolas, there was presented one for a subsidy to an individual steamship company. All must see that the effect of this was calculated to weaken our higher claim, and to place us at a disadvantage before Haïti and before all the world.

And now, since the American people have been made thoroughly acquainted with one view of this question, I know of no interest which will suffer and no just obligation which will be impaired by the presentation of such facts as I have here submitted to the public judgment. If in this my course is thought to be unusual, it should be remembered that the course pursued toward me by the press has been unusual, and that they who had no censure for the latter should have none for the former.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS.

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL,

EDITOR OF "THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW" FROM 1864 TO 1873.

BY RICHARD HENRY STODDARD.

THE hand of death, which has struck down so many writers of distinction during the last decade, has struck down no one who has been more sincerely and widely lamented than Mr. Lowell. He belonged to the earlier race of American writers,—the generation which, beginning in the first years of the century, speedily eclipsed all who went before, and, overshadowing all contemporary lights, still eclipses all who have come after,—the generation of Hawthorne, and Emerson, and Longfellow, and of which, now that Lowell has gone, only two representatives remain. We lament him, not as we might have done a quarter of a century ago, when much of his work was still to be performed, but as we lament one who, giving all he had to give, has burdened us with a debt of gratitude which we are anxious to acknowledge, and added to our annals an illustrious name which we are proud to honor.

To say that we are more indebted to Lowell than to any of his famous peers is not to say that he was greater than they, but that his gifts were more numerous than theirs,—which is true, since to those which were the inheritance of his genius he added others from provinces that he made tributary to it,—and that he employed these gifts with a directness, a force, a knowledge, an adjustment of means to ends, which his contemporaries did not possess, and which is rare among men of letters. A poet, he was more than a poet; a critic, he was more than a critic; a thinker, he was more than a thinker; from beginning to end he was a man,—a man in every fibre and every feeling, right-minded, clear-minded, strong-minded, honest, honorable, courageous, resolute. He was this, and more, for to this there was superadded the something which makes the man the gen-

tleman, and the gentleman the man of the world. There was nothing provincial about him. No American writer was ever better and few were ever so well equipped for the profession to which he devoted himself with such sincerity and fidelity, such singleness of purpose and such unwavering determination. He was a scholar in the best sense of the word, possessed of a thorough knowledge of English literature and critically conversant with other literatures as well,—the classics of Greece and Rome, and the classics of Spain and Italy, France and Germany. A scholar, not a pedant, he mastered his learning, and it profited him in the large horizons which it disclosed to his spiritual vision, and the felicity and dignity which it imparted to his style. Gentleman and scholar in all that he wrote, there is that in his writing which declares a greater intellect than it reveals. He was more than his work. What this work was some of us may have forgotten in a measure, and others may never have known except in a casual, fragmentary way. But known or unknown, it is well that we should understand it in its entirety,—a duty which Mr. Lowell rendered easy, and a pleasure which he rendered inviting, not long before his death, by collecting a complete edition of his writings. Let us see what they are, and in order to do so let us read them chronologically, which is the best way, and, indeed, the only way, whereby the protean mind of a writer can be traced.

Mr. Lowell began his career with a volume of verse fifty years ago, and as he was only twenty-two it was necessarily immature and tentative. It determined two things, which may or may not have been perceived by its readers,—one, that the writer was a poet; the other, that he was like no other American poet. The master poet of the period—the one who was acknowledged before all others—was Bryant, and many were they who sought to wrap themselves in his mantle of meditation. Another was Willis, whose Scriptural pieces had a certain vogue; and another, Halleck, whose rhythmical rhetoric about Marco Bozzaris was being murdered by every schoolboy in the land. The popular poet, however, was Longfellow, whose "Voices of the Night" was published two years before Mr. Lowell's first book. He was read by everybody, including the guild of minor rhymesters, who, failing to detect his poetic virtues, laid violent and clumsy hands on his poetic vices, chiefest among which were the pursuit of obvious sim-

iles (everything being like something else) and the promulgation of cheap didacticism. They raved, recited, maddened, till the land was filled with lesser Longfellows. Of these was not our young gentleman of Cambridge, who betrayed no familiarity with contemporary verse of home production, and not so much acquaintance with the imported article as was common among his countrymen. He was not a second-rate Campbell, a hirsute Hemans, or an undeveloped Wordsworth. The only English poet whom he seemed to have read with admiration was a young person named Tennyson, who had published two thin volumes about ten years before, and whose reputation was still to be made. To say that he was impressed by Tennyson is to say that he was impressed by whatever is most purely poetic in English verse, and was *en rapport* with its master spirits; the line to which Tennyson belongs going back through Keats to Milton, and Shakespeare, and Spenser, and Chaucer. The spell of the young Tennyson was on the young Lowell when he wrote "Threnodia" and "The Sirens," which were inspired by his lyrics, as "Irené," "To Perdita Singing," "Allegra," and "Rosaline" were copied from his portraits of ideal women.

Outside of these poems the feet of Mr. Lowell could not be tracked in the snow of other men's thoughts. He was as original as a young poet could be; for, consciously or unconsciously, every young poet is a follower of somebody, and his voice is an echo of some other voice; and he was nowhere so original as in "The Beggar," "The Heritage," "The Fatherland," and the song beginning "Violet, sweet violet!" What was not so original was the "Ode" in which the poet proclaimed the grandeur of his calling, mouthing about his mission in one or two hundred magniloquent lines, the sense of which was in inverse ratio to the sound, and which were crowded with images that were too splendid to be remembered. Like many another young poet, Mr. Lowell took himself too seriously. He pleased his readers, however, and probably more in this sonorous "Ode" than in his more poetical poems, for the thing which then called itself Taste in New England set strongly towards high resolves, earnest endeavors, divine dissatisfactions, and other transcendental trumpery, and away from genuine emotion and natural expression, of which there was no lack in Mr. Lowell's unstudied sonnets. What was most notable in his poetry at this time (apart from the poetry itself) was the simplicity, the grace, the accuracy, and the purity of its English,

which, like the English of Keats and Beddoes, was so perfect as to seem inevitable.

In Mr. Lowell's second volume, which was published three years later, there was less spontaneity and more preparation,—less of delight in the singing, but more of satisfaction in the song. Where before he had hesitated and doubted, he was now certain and confident. He tottered no longer, with his fingers in the hands of others, but stood up without help, stoutly and proudly, and went whithersoever he would. His horizon was enlarged and the spirit in his feet led him further and further. One has not to read many pages in this second book to see that the writer was maturing, that he thought with more precision and decision, and that his touch on the instrument was firmer and surer, —sometimes, perhaps, a little too firm and sure, for if he had gained in strength, he had lost in sweetness. There were new elements and activities here,—essays on stronger lines, ventures in broader fields. One was in the direction of dramatic writing, as indicated in soliloquy ; another in the direction of story-telling, as outlined in the presentation of incidents or experiences. The first of these movements was manifested in "Prometheus" and "Columbus"; the second in "Rhœcus" and "A Glance Behind the Curtain." The form of poetic art at which Mr. Lowell aimed in "Prometheus" and "Columbus" was, if not discovered by, first cultivated by, Tennyson and Browning,—by Tennyson in "Ulysses," which was given to the world, we believe, in 1842, and by Browning in "Artemis Prologuizes," which was written two or three years later.

The intention of these poets, in the poems specified, was dramatic, but they cannot be said to have realized it in these poems, whatever they may have done in later ones, for, critically speaking, they are rather representative than dramatic, in that the writers have not succeeded in merging their own personality in the personality of their characters. It is not Ulysses who speaks to us in the grave, wise words which are so impressive, but Tennyson behind the mask of Ulysses. Neither is it Columbus who speaks to us, but Mr. Lowell, who has donned the garb of that daring old navigator. We listen to Columbus with respect, for his emotion is noble and his speech grandiose ; and with a certain sense of satisfaction, for if he does not convince us that he will discover a world, he convinces us that his other self has discovered one in

the new-old world of English blank verse, which is to all other verse what the continent is to what it contains—the mountains that declare its grandeur, the forests that preserve its solitudes, the lakes that mirror its skies, and the rivers that wind their way seaward freighted with all its treasures. Before Mr. Lowell Bryant was the only American poet who wrote good blank verse: how many American poets have written it since? His mastery of blank verse was magnificent, but it was faulty, since it was often careless and exuberant. Given a theme which demanded it, he was a good while in getting it well in hand, and when he did get it in hand, he was so jubilant with what was before him that he pranced, and curveted, and, digging his spurs in, began before the beginning. "Rhœcus" would have been a better poem than it is if he could have persuaded himself to sacrifice the first thirty-five lines which he wrote, which are not only not necessary, but wholly unnecessary, since they delay the reader, who, if he wants anything, wants the poem, and not the lesson which it is supposed to enforce, but which it should not enforce; for if it be there, he should find it for himself, or, not finding it, should feel it, as he could not fail to do if the art of the poet were what it should be. That a poem should be a poem, and nothing else, was a truth that Mr. Lowell did not recognize, though he did not ignore it to the same extent as Longfellow, who was perpetually, while Lowell was only occasionally, didactic; the difference being that the one sang his song and deduced his moral, while the other sang his moral and deduced his song. They liked that sort of thing in New England then, but it was not art, and never will be art.

There were qualities in this second book which revealed an active and fertile mind, a quick sympathy with and a clear comprehension of sorrow and suffering, a profound belief in the brotherhood of man, the recognition of high ideals in private and public conduct, courage of convictions and contempt for creeds, and, present everywhere, though rather felt than seen, an instinctive love of nature. Manifestations of these qualities (which the reader of this paper will kindly classify for himself), are "Hunger and Cold" and "The Landlord," which fulfill the best requirements of poems for the people, that so many versifiers were trying to write then; "The Search," "Extreme Unction," "Above and Below," "The Ghost-Seer," "Bibliolatres," "The

Dandelion," which was a worthy companion-piece to Emerson's "Humblebee," and the "Ode to France" (but that, however, was still to be written), which will bear reading after Coleridge's glorious ode to the same grand but unfortunate country and people. In these poems, and others which belong to the same period, we have Mr. Lowell in the moods and limitations of his early manhood. He was serious rather than thoughtful, speculative rather than meditative. He felt more than he knew, and, writing from inspiration rather than deliberation, he was more fervid than finished. Words came to him before thoughts, and his eloquence outran his sense. He stammered in his haste, and, deficient in the musical sense, his harmonies were often harsh, and his melodies unmelodious. His songs did not sing themselves. He was austere, but not gracious; admirable, but not attractive. We acknowledged his strength, but did not love it; for, unlike that in the riddle of Samson, it did not bring forth sweetness.

In his next venture, "The Vision of Sir Launfal," Mr. Lowell's contributions to poetic poetry ended for a time. The longest poem that he had yet written, it was written with an enthusiasm which carried its readers away whether they would or not. It was a theme which might well have inspired the greatest poet, it was so noble in itself, and so suggestive of the noblest things, and its selection by Mr. Lowell was fortunate, for of all the poets of the time he was best fitted to receive it reverently and entertain it royally. To others a mediæval tradition, to him it was a poetic parable, the meaning of which was that, begin and end where it might in tradition, the Quest of the Holy Grail could, in poetry, begin and end nowhere but in the human heart. To discover this was to divine the original through the translation, and to identify it with the process of nature, which has nothing to do with morals, but everything to do with life. There may be faults in the letter of this glorious "Vision," but the spirit which held the hand that wrote the stanza on June is impeccable.

Up to this time, when he had reached his twenty-seventh year, Mr. Lowell was known to his countrymen only as a man with whom poetry had been a serious intellectual pursuit; they were now to know him as a man to whom poetry had become a strong satirical business, in which he revealed unexpected and extraor-

dinary powers. These powers were the growth of seeds which are inherent in every man of New England parentage, whether he knows it or no, and which were as vigorous then as when they were quickened to life at Concord and Bunker Hill. A poet, he was a patriot, which to be then was to be a politician also,—not in the vulgar sense, which was hateful to him, as to every man with whom politics mean principle, not party, but the noble sense which made Milton the Latin secretary of Cromwell. Not in the learned tongue, which, like Milton, he knew so well, nor in literary language, of which he was so skilful a master, but in the vernacular of the unlettered American rustic, did Mr. Lowell write "The Biglow Papers," which reached and were understanded by the people for whom they were written. They expressed their opinions upon topics in which they could not but be interested, and in words which were habitual with them,—in their simple, homely, downright, every-day speech. They were forcible with the common-sense which is uncommon, and with the humor which distinguishes great men who keep their eyes and ears open. But besides this common-sense and this humor, there were in "The Biglow Papers" a wisdom and a wit which were equally forcible and more rare; for if Hosea Biglow was in a certain sense a creation of genius, the Rev. Homer Wilbur, A. M., was absolutely such: a lesser writer might have evolved the supposititious poet, but only Mr. Lowell himself, in his happiest moods, could have created that prim, opinionated, pedantic, delightful old parson.

"The Biglow Papers" was followed, in the same year, by "A Fable for Critics," which, begun as a squib, still remains a squib, though the cleverest in many ways in English literature. If one doubts this fact, he should read Suckling's "Sessions of the Poets," Hunt's "Feast of the Poets," and Byron's "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers," and he will doubt it no longer. As a consensus of poetical criticism on American authorship forty years ago it is witty and amusing, shrewd and far-sighted, playful but earnest, satirical but not cynical, and, bating a pet aversion or two, just and generous. But brilliant and versatile as it is, it is not a poem, and it was not until it was off his hands that Mr. Lowell put on his singing-robes and was once more the poet he was born to be. He was then what he had been, and more, for the years had not only brought the philosophic mind, but with it

broader and sweeter sympathies, higher and deeper emotions, and the mellowness which comes from strenuous exercise of worldly wisdom and constant practice of gracious deeds. Mr. Lowell was at his best and greatest when he wrote "Under the Willows," "The Cathedral," and the "Ode Recited at the Harvard Commemoration."

The time may not have come to fix Mr. Lowell's rank as a poet, but the time has come to fix his rank as a critic, which is a higher one than that of any and every other writer who has essayed criticism in America. He had a breadth of scholarship, obvious and recondite, and a catholicity of taste and judgment, which no one else here possessed; and whether he wrote of Milton or Dryden, Lessing or Rousseau, Dante or Shakespeare, he was alike incomparable and admirable. But this is no news to the readers of this periodical, with which he was for years connected, and which has been enriched with many of his papers. He was a great critic and a noble poet, and when he passed away he was the most eminent man of letters in America.

R. H. STODDARD.

"RECIPROCITY" AND CANADA.

BY WILLIAM HENRY HURLBERT.

THE Protectionists of the United States have not gone as far as the Protectionists of Australia, who have notified free-trade England that they will accept no federal constitution of the Australian provinces, or "states," in which protection is not made a principle of the organic law of the land. This puzzles their friends in England, who perhaps forget that not very long ago Lord Brougham thought it "unconstitutional" to meddle with protection in England. But the American Protectionists have established a condition of "commercial belligerency" with all the world outside the Union, subject only to certain mitigations or truces which may, under the name of "treaties of reciprocity," be proclaimed by the President.

These "treaties" are not treaties, as they need not be ratified by the Senate. They are executive arrangements which, as affecting the public revenue, Congress has authorized.

Such arrangements have already been made, not only with two independent American republics, Brazil and Santo Domingo, but with a great American dependency of Spain. It remains to be seen how they will work, and there are already murmurs both from Spain and from Cuba. Whether these arrangements were inspired or conducted or concluded by the President, or by the Secretary of State, it does not concern my present purpose to inquire. Possibly my accomplished friend, Mr. Foster, of Indiana, to whom analogous arrangements with Mexico and with Spain were entrusted ten years ago, may some day enlighten the world on this point. But be this as it may, further negotiations for a commercial truce with the Dominion of Canada were announced in April of this year. The country had hardly heard of them before it was mystified by the information that they had been interrupted by a grotesque "international episode" of cross-

telegrams and countermanded special trains between Washington and Ottawa.

It was then understood that these negotiations would be resumed during the current month of October; and the most ardent Free-Trader in America must hope, as a matter of decency, that when they are resumed the Secretary of State may be well enough to take personal control of them.

We have the word of Sir Charles Tupper for it, in a speech delivered by him—I think at Toronto—on the eve of the last Canadian elections, that he then, in March, 1891, had "every reason to believe" that Mr. Blaine then saw his way to proposing a plan of "commercial reciprocity" with Canada which would interfere neither with the autonomy of the Dominion nor with the operation by the United States of that system of protection to which, notwithstanding his pungent criticisms of the McKinley Law as originally framed, Mr. Blaine, in magnificent contempt alike of political economy and of the lessons of the American census, emphatically attributes the prosperity of the United States. If Mr. Blaine has such a plan and thinks he can see his way also to getting the new House of Representatives to confirm it, it will be interesting to see him try his hand at it. Wallis discovered the binomial theorem while he was looking for the quadrature of the circle, and it was only through persistent looking for the quadrature of the circle that pundits were brought at last to give up the hope of finding it.

"Reciprocity" is only an international form of protection. It is cutting a dike after a dike has been built at great cost "to keep the level of a nation's wealth," as an early Protectionist said, "above the surrounding element." The word is a mongrel and a bastard, like the thing. Bastards, however, are sometimes more beautiful than their legitimate brethren, and the word "reciprocity" is certainly less troublesome and cacophonous than "reciprocality." This was perhaps Franklin's reason for adopting it, if, as there is some reason to suppose, Franklin is responsible for its use in the public document in which, so far as I know, it first made its bow to the world of politics and diplomacy. The actual paternity of the word lies, I believe, between Blackstone and that wily and evasive British statesman with whom Franklin so often tried conclusions, Lord Shelburne. But it was first officially used in November, 1782, and, curiously

enough, in the provisional treaty of peace between England and the United States.

The thing "reciprocity," I need not say, is of earlier date. It is coeval with the "mercantile theory" against which Sir William Petty and Sir Dudley North made such a strenuous fight at the end of the seventeenth century. A very fair type of all the "arrangements" on which our modern Protectionists so confidently rely is to be found in the famous Methuen treaty of 1703 between England and Portugal. The political object of that treaty was to "head off" the drift of Pedro II., of Portugal, towards Louis XIV., and the policy of "abolishing the Pyrenees." Its commercial object was to tempt Portugal into admitting the textile fabrics of England on better terms than those of Germany and France, by admitting Portuguese wines into England on better terms than the wines of France and Germany. This, it will be seen, was genuine "reciprocity" "arranged" for the benefit of clothiers in England and vine-growers in Portugal, at the expense alike of every Portuguese who wore a coat and breeches, and of every Englishman who drank a glass of wine.

The Right Honorable John Methuen, who was sent out by Lord Godolphin to negotiate it, was the very man for the work. His heart was in it, for he was the son of an energetic Scotch manufacturer of woollen goods who had established himself in Wiltshire, where he drove a roaring trade and founded a noble family. He was inspired by filial piety, as Mr. Gladstone was when he began his career in Parliament by a vigorous attack upon Lord Althorp's proposition that the West Indian planters should be made to pay a small weekly wage to their negroes during the years of apprenticeship which were to precede the complete emancipation of the West Indian slaves. His treaty delighted the English manufacturers, who were then all Protectionists, at the expense of the English landowners, who were then Free-Traders. It set Englishmen who had been getting tipsy on hock and claret under the Stuarts, to getting tipsy on port under the Guelphs. It cemented the alliance of Portugal with England, and so may be said to have led indirectly to Waterloo. But, like all "class legislation," it tended to pauperize a part of the community in both England and Portugal; and its abrogation after more than a century, in 1834, was one

of the premonitory symptoms of that great change in her fiscal policy to which the England of the Cato Street conspiracy and the Bristol and Nottingham riots unquestionably owes so much of the unexampled prosperity she has enjoyed for the last thirty years as she does not owe to the American Civil War and to the persistent sacrifice during the same period, by successive American administrations, of the interests of "the masses" to the interests of "the classes" in the United States.

The President and his Secretary of State are welcome to such comfort as they can legitimately get out of the history of "reciprocity" in the old world.

What concerns the American people is that there should be as thorough a threshing-out as possible, during these impending negotiations at Washington, of the true bearing of "reciprocity" upon the future of the new world; and in view of this it is much to be regretted that the negotiations must now be conducted without the invaluable coöperation of the eminent statesman upon whom his Canadian countrymen have conferred the title of "Father of the Confederation." No man now living in Canada, in Great Britain, or in the United States can pretend to such an intimate familiarity with all the issues involved in the relations of Canada with the British Empire and with the United States as fifty years of political experience had given to the late Premier of the Dominion. He presided over the establishment of the Dominion by the British Parliament in 1867. When he entered political life in Canada, the existence of the American Union was threatened by the sectional opposition of New England to the admission of the ephemeral republic of Texas. As a member of the Canadian Government ten years afterwards, he assisted Lord Elgin in carrying through a treaty of commercial reciprocity with the United States, which were then administered by public men uninfluenced by what Adam Smith calls the "mean and malignant arguments of restraint." Under the operation of this treaty, Sir John saw the commercial movement between the United States and British North America rise in six years from a total of $20,671,750 in 1853 to a total of $47,881,625 in 1859. He saw the abrogation of this treaty ten years afterwards by the American party which is now in power; and he then led Canada into fighting protection with protection. What was the

result ? In 1889, after twenty years of commercial belligerency, the commercial movement between the countries amounted to $99,891,394. So that, speaking roughly, we have an increase of only about 117 per cent. after twenty years of "commercial belligerency," against an increase of 130 per cent. in six years of commercial peace. Of the $7,829,099 of goods exported by the United States to British North America in 1853, before the negotiation of the Elgin-Marcy treaty of June 5, 1854, nearly 50 per cent., or $3,822,587, was of foreign production transmitted through the United States. Under the operation of the Elgin-Marcy treaty in 1859 only about 30 per cent. of the American exports, or $5,501,125, was of foreign production, against $13,-439,667 of domestic American production. In connection with which point, by the way, it may be well to note that between 1878 and 1888 the percentage of American imports into Canada fell from 53.33 to 47.14, and the percentage of British imports from 41.04 to 38.21, while the percentage of French imports into Canada rose from 1.52 to 2.17, the percentage of Spanish (West Indian) imports from 0.46 to 2.37, and the percentage of German imports from 0.44 to 3.27 ! These figures, taken in connection with the efforts which the Canadian Pacific managers are making to accelerate steam connection between Asia and Europe, are of nterest. During the last ten years the imports from Japan and China into Canada have been from 0.42 to 2.06 of the Canadian import trade. In 1889 the per-capita proportion of the Canadian foreign trade to the population amounted to $40.27, against a like proportion of no more than $22.88 to the population of the Union.

No one can now say how far Sir John Macdonald really believed in what is known in England as "imperial federation." Of course he knew that without the cordial coöperation of Canada "imperial federation" is not likely ever to get beyond the iridescent stage of speeches, resolutions, and banquets. But it is not easy to believe that he can ever have seriously contemplated a practical grapple with such a problem in fiscal and legislative organization as a political federation of the United Kingdom and British North America with Australasia and the Indian Empire. It is idle to speculate now as to what might have been, had the British Government of 1783 coöperated with Jay and Adams at Versailles to establish "com-

mercial reciprocity" between the thirteen new and independent American States and all parts of the British dominions excepting the territories of the chartered companies in the East Indies and on Hudson's Bay. The whole face of the world has been changed since George III. helped Franklin and the French to spoil that plan. If even so much as a customs union is ever to be formed which shall include all branches of the English-speaking race, the analogies all indicate that such a union must follow, not precede, the development of every important branch into an independent tree, with roots struck deep into the soil of its own area. This conviction was doubtless in the mind of Lord Salisbury when he subtly put away the patriotic importunity of Lord Rosebery, Lord Brassey, and other leaders of the Federation League, by inviting them to submit a working project for a federal union. "You have stated," he said, "a problem—I might almost call it an enigma. Let us have your notion of how it can be solved!"

The American Union could never have been framed excepting by a group of absolutely independent and autonomous sovereignties, and an "imperial federation" of colonies and dependencies with a preponderating metropolis has become less, and not more, practicable with the progress of representative institutions during the nineteenth century. Even as things now are, one of the Australian colonies has calmly nullified the unquestionable prerogative of the British crown to nominate its own representatives; and Mr. Goldwin Smith is probably right when he tells us that if an imperial federation were formed "Her Majesty would have to choose between the British and the Pan-Britannic crown."

But whatever may have been the views of Sir John Macdonald as to the future of the Dominion he did so much to found, he certainly looked forward to that future as involving not a divergence, but a convergence between the interests of Canada and the interests of the United States.

In 1866, not long after the repulse by Canadian volunteers of the outrageous Fenian invasion which in the summer of that year gave so much trouble not only to President Johnson and to General Grant, but to all the politicians of the United States, it was my fortune to be the guest of Sir John Macdonald at a banquet given to him by his constituents in Kingston. The occasion certainly did not invite any cordial expression of good will towards my country. In

spite of the American Government, Canadian soil had been invaded, Canadian lives had been lost in repelling the invaders, and Canada had been threatened with the horrors of war—not to avenge any wrong suffered at Canadian hands, but solely by way of "striking a blow" at a friendly government and people three thousand miles away, beyond the Atlantic. Sir John might have been pardoned if in such circumstances he had given some expression, even in the presence of an American Democrat, to the not unnatural emotions of his own people. But he did nothing of the sort. He did not even allude to the Fenian "naval victory" off Eastport! On the contrary, he took that opportunity of doing full justice, and possibly a little more than justice, to the conduct of the American authorities.

We are not now emerging from, and I certainly hope we are not now entering upon, a period of "villanous saltpetre" in our relations with Canada. But we are now passing through a period of "commercial belligerency"; and it is important that, on the eve of negotiations intended, we must assume, to terminate, or at least to modify, this "belligerency," we should rightly estimate the temper and the aims of the Dominion.

We want as little prejudice and passion as possible imported into the question of our commercial relations with the most important, the most progressive, and the most enlightened nation with which, on this continent, we have to deal—a nation with which, under the existing conditions of progress in the new world and in the old, we must count, in the not distant future, not as a mere satellite of Great Britain, but as a group of commonwealths more considerable from the American point of view than any European power of the second rank.

Canadian politics, like our own, are rather cloudy just now, but the government at Ottawa is still in the hands of public men committed to the policy of the late Premier. The negotiations at Washington will probably be conducted, as they would have been had Sir John still lived, by Sir Charles Tupper, who was associated with Mr. Chamberlain in those "fishery negotiations" at Washington, in 1888, with the results of which both Democratic and Republican public men in this country have professed at least a Platonic satisfaction, and to whose thorough fairness and good will towards the United States Mr. Phelps, the representative in London of President Cleveland's government,

bore emphatic public witness at the "Fishmongers'" banquet not long before his return to this country.

But whoever may conduct the negotiations at Washington, those negotiations must fix public attention upon the question how far the official intromission of the Parliamentary executive of Great Britain in the commercial relations between the Union and the Dominion is an element of mischief, and how far an element of good, in the relations, not only of Canada with the United States, but of the Dominion and the Union, respectively, with Great Britain.

This is a cardinal question which seems to me likely to be the most important outcome of Mr. Blaine's Canadian negotiations. If all of us do not soon begin to consider it temperately and judiciously, the time is not far off when it will get itself considered perhaps neither temperately nor judiciously. Everybody who has followed, even in the most cursory way, the history of the interminable fishery questions, which have been debated and discussed almost to the fighting-point between London and Washington during the last two generations, must be aware that the complication of purely Canadian and American with purely British issues has been, throughout all these discussions and debates, a permanent source of confusion and irritation. Is the "commercial belligerency" of the present moment between the Dominion and the Union anything more than an incident of the "commercial belligerency" developed by our system of protection between the United States and the United Kingdom? Doubtless it is made more acute and therefore more costly to the taxpayers, upon whom the burden of this sort, as of all sorts, of "belligerency" eventually falls, by the unwise attempt of the Canadians to seek prosperity through protection. But would not the prospect of relief from it through some diplomatic transaction be brighter than it now is were such a transaction to be carried on exclusively between Ottawa and Washington? Is not the direct and, indeed, primary participation of the British Foreign Office in any such transaction between the Dominion and the Union likely to impede rather than to further its success?

All the analogies indicate that the less Great Britain meddles with the relations between the Dominion and the Union, the better it will be for all parties concerned. There is a growing dislike in the United States to any active interference of Europe

in American questions. This may be deplored, but it cannot wisely be ignored. Why does this feeling deepen with the development of the Dominion? It is not a mere arrogant outcry of "Hands off!" to the old world. Americans object to British interference in questions between the United States and Canada, not at all because Canada chose at the time of the American Revolution to resist the natural, but rather unscrupulous, attempt of the confederated colonies to draw her, with what are now the maritime provinces of the Dominion, into the revolutionary contest; nor yet because Canada unquestionably still desires to maintain her connection with the British crown as an autonomous member of the British Empire. Theoretically, there is no more reason why friction should arise between Canada and the United States on account of the presence in Canada of a British viceroy, representing the British crown, than why friction should arise for a similar reason between the United States and the island of Jamaica, which a hundred years ago, after we had become a nation, was more important to us than Canada. But practically there is a wide difference between the two cases. The area of Canada is so enormous; it is conterminous with that of the United States throughout so long a line; the frontier is crossed and recrossed by waterways and railway connections so extensive; the products of each country and its natural resources are so necessary to the people of the other, that the interference, in any form which practically affects their commercial relations, of a third power, lying three thousand miles away and existing under conditions entirely different from those which dominate both Canada and the United States, must inevitably give rise to difficulties and misunderstandings not only between the two great parties primarily interested, but between both of them, sooner or later, and the third party so interfering.

What reason was there, for example, in the local interests of Canada for those navigation clauses in the Anglo-American convention of 1818 out of which so much trouble has been made between England and America during the protracted discussion of the fishery questions? What reason is there now, in the commercial relations of Great Britain with the United States, for the assertion by Canada, as against the United States, of these clauses in the convention of 1818?

Is it impossible for Canada, while continuing its connection with the British Empire, and preserving in its parliamentary system, the advantages of an executive appointed by the British crown, to be left free to regulate its own commercial relations, not only with the United States, but with all the world? Why should London be required to pass on questions as to the load-line of Canadian vessels or the cattle trade of Canada with the United States? In business matters Great Britain is as much a foreign country to Canada as are the United States. No less than 40 per cent. of the amount of duties collected by Canada in 1889 was collected on goods from Great Britain, against only 32 per cent. collected on goods from the United States.

Would not the position of those Canadian statesmen who now object to "unrestricted reciprocity" between the United States and Canada be stronger than it now is if England were out of the question? Why should England herself desire, in the interest of her empire, to exercise any shadow of control through the British Parliamentary executive over the commercial relations of Canada, after abandoning, as she has abandoned, all control over the fiscal system of Canada? If Canada may lay, as she now lays, duties on British imports, either for natural and reasonable purposes of revenue or for artificial and absurd purposes of protection, why may she not form treaties with the United States, or France, or Germany, for the regulation of her commerce, by land and sea, with any and with all of these nations? In what respect would the bonds of sentiment, of political machinery, and of financial investment, which alone now really unite Canada with Great Britain, be seriously impaired by the abandonment to Canada absolutely of such a treaty-making power? Why should not Canada have a minister of her own at Washington, as Bavaria and Saxony, for example, had their own envoys at London and Paris under the old German Bund? Australia has just been framing a project for a general Australian union, and in this project Australia peremptorily demands the right to make all treaties with all powers on the Pacific; a demand which really covers France, Spain, and Germany, as well as China and Siam and Japan. If this must be conceded to Australia, why should less be conceded to Canada? Nay, why should even Newfoundland be denied what cannot be refused to Australia?

Is it not time, in other words, for the Dominion to be treated,

not by the United States only, but by Great Britain, as an American, and no longer in any entangling sense a European, nationality ?

Can it be to the interest of any European power to resist in any way the currents which are emancipating the American continents absolutely from any direct political connection with Europe ? How are the Germans taking Lord Lorne's clever suggestion that they should leave Africa to England and make the Argentine a German protectorate ?

Is it not to the interest of England, above all other European powers, to recognize the force and to facilitate the flow of these currents ? Would it not have been wiser for Spain to do this in the days of Canning and in the case of the nationalities which then began to arise out of the disintegration of the Spanish power in the new world ? Are not the elements of a new nationality stronger and more numerous in the case of Canada than they were in the case of Mexico, of Peru, of Chili, or of the Argentine Republic ?

Is it necessary to say that these considerations in no wise look to any absorption of the Dominion by the Union ?

Certainly the difficulties in the way of the absorption of the Dominion by the Union are at least as great as in the way of the absorption by the Union of Mexico. The republic of Texas was a merely transitional outcome of American emigration, enterprise, colonization, and conquest. It was organized only to be annexed. The annexation of California merely led to the occupation of a region virtually uninhabited. The problems presented to the American people by a serious attempt to absorb the Dominion into the Union would be both new and formidable ; so formidable, indeed, and so new, that the contingency of any such attempt within any immediately assignable period of time, except as an outcome of some form of "belligerency," may well be left out of the question in considering the immediate future of the relations between Canada, Great Britain, and the United States.

While for many reasons any movement toward a political union of the Dominion with the United States must be, for a long time to come, as its warmest advocates in Canada admit, quite hopeless and visionary, there are considerations of the highest importance which militate against any serious attempt on the part of the

United States to promote the entrance of Canada into the Union.

Perhaps the most important of these is the certainty that out of the enormous area of the Dominion it would be found politically necessary to carve such a number of new American States as must seriously disturb the balance of power between the different sections of the Union in the more important branch of Congress. The two provinces of Ontario and Quebec are much more than equal in extent to the combined areas of New York, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. Under the arbitration of 1878 Pennsylvania and Indiana might have been thrown in, into the bargain! Were Ontario and Quebec admitted to the Union, with nearly four millions of inhabitants, they would give us at the least five new States, seating ten new Senators. They would also give us the education question in its Canadian form, and the question of the French Canadian Church with its treaty rights and its vast vested interests. How could the maritime provinces be got in except as separate States? New Brunswick would balance Oregon; Nova Scotia would speak up for her apples and her mines as loudly as California and Nevada; Newfoundland, with an area equal to that of Ohio, would throw her two senatorial votes "all the time" for a great navy. And what of Manitoba with her wheat, Alberta with her horses, and British Columbia with the Pacific at her feet? It is a moderate estimate that annexation would throw into the Senate at least twenty Senators, all representing interests widely different from those of the Atlantic States, the Gulf States, and the States of the Mississippi Valley.

It may be well for any American who feels disposed to precipitate such an experiment as this in the adjustment and balance of our confederate system to look into the history of the apportionment bills of 1792 and of Washington's first veto. Have the immigration question and the labor question become simpler or more complicated since the abolition of slavery? I have great faith in the assimilative power of the American system. But the eagle has not yet given place on our escutcheon to the ostrich.

Of course it is impossible, within the limits of this article, to do more than indicate such considerations as these, though it is also impossible, without much fuller and more minute discussion of these, adequately to weigh their force. But to state them should suffice to show how absolutely foreign to the purpose of

this paper, how inconsistent even with its purpose, would be any consideration, even for a moment, of such a possibility as the absorption of Canada by the United States. On the contrary, many things go to show that, in the interest of both Canada and the United States, a very considerable development of the Dominion, as an independent power, is eminently to be desired. There is no reason why such an independent power may not be, there are scores of reasons why it must be, at once a moderating influence in the home politics and a trustworthy ally in the international relations of the United States. Its action must tend to more, not to less, friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain.

Forty years ago Sir Henry Taylor wrote to Lord Grey that, while he thought the North American colonies useful to Great Britain, he also considered any uses "not obtainable from them as independent nations no more than dust in the balance compared with the evil contingencies." The "uses" of Canada to Great Britain have perhaps increased since 1852; the "evil contingencies" have certainly not diminished. But will not England's way to India across the American continent be more secure under conditions of friendship and alliance between a commercially-independent Dominion and the American Union than is her way to India through the Suez Canal under the conditions of the existing English protectorate at Cairo?

WM. HENRY HURLBERT.

STRAWS.

BY COLONEL HENRY WATTERSON.

I.

IT IS THE UNEXPECTED THAT HAPPENS.

In nothing is the speculative predilection of the average American shown so markedly as in the field of political conjecture, where, in the event that occasion requires, it may be humored without cost or risk of any sort. We are, indeed, a nation of politicians, if not of gamesters, and he is but a poor specimen of the race who, born a sovereign, cannot serve at once as his own prime minister and prophet. Hence statesmanship with us is the reverse of an exact science; out of all relation to mathematical precision; being in a state of actual and constant war with geometrical progression, to say nothing of other forms of progress.

A surmise to-day as to the condition of parties to-morrow has nothing whatever to rest upon except the filigree of imagination, the frail and trellised but insubstantial frameories of guesswork. One man's prediction is as good as another's. Nor is this peculiar to the present moment. It has been the rule these fifty years; and it springs not less from the temperament of the people than from the exigencies which that temperament constantly forces upon the party managers.

Party platforms were long ago made only to be broken. Party nominations have long been the children of accident. From Polk to Harrison, in the national conventions, it has been the unexpected which, with a single exception, has come to pass. That exception was Buchanan, who owed his good fortune in this particular to an honorable, though an irksome, banishment to the Court of St. James's during the stormy years that, following the inauguration of Franklin Pierce, laid each of his rivals in the dust and made him the available candidate in 1856. Polk, Pierce, Lincoln, Hayes, Garfield, Cleveland, and Harrison were each a new man in the presidential arena, whose nomination was brought around by the laws of expediency, and each proved more or less a surprise to the country. In the cases of Polk, Pierce,

and Garfield the surprise was great and universal. In those of Lincoln and Cleveland it was anticipated by hardly more than a year of popular knowledge that such persons had an existence.

Among the papers of the late Justice Stanley Matthews, of the Supreme Court, may be found a very curious document partly in the handwriting of President Polk. It is a newspaper article urging the nomination of Martin Van Buren. With this the writing of Mr. Polk leaves off, and another pen takes up the theme, urging the nomination of Mr. Polk for *Vice-President*. This queer example of the eccentricities of American politics was written and printed in Mr. Polk's home organ in Tennessee less than a month before his own nomination for the Presidency. Yet at the time it appeared he was a very doubtful entry, as turfmen say, for second place.

In the organization of the Liberal movement of 1872 there was objection among a certain set of reformers to Mr. Greeley, and therefore to Mr. Whitelaw Reid, who appeared at Cincinnati as Mr. Greeley's personal representative; but it being argued with much plausibility that Mr. Greeley could in no event receive the nomination, and that the support of *The Tribune* might be needed in the coming campaign, Mr. Reid was finally admitted to full fellowship, solely to clinch Mr. Greeley and *The Tribune*. The accession of Johnson and Arthur to the Presidency baffles melodrama; whilst, except for what followed, the elevation of both Lincoln and Cleveland would rival the *grotesquerie* of comic opera.

II.

SUPPOSE,—? Taking up the cue of the unexpected, which so often happens,—with historic examples for a warrant,—let us make a brief survey of the political field and humor the mood both of speculation and the speculator with regard to coming events, possible and otherwise.

Suppose Governor Campbell is reëlected in Ohio and it is indicated clearly that under his leadership Ohio can be relied on in 1892 by the Democrats: is there not good reason to believe that he would enter the next Democratic National Convention with an almost irresistible prestige? Suppose Governor Boies is reëlected in Iowa by a good majority, and Governor Campbell is defeated in Ohio: would not that make Governor Boies a formidable candidate? Suppose the Republicans should carry New York in the coming

fall election : what effect would this have upon the Cleveland and Hill factions in the Empire State? Suppose none of these things happens, but that New York comes to the next National Convention either divided in her choice or opposing outright the nomination of Mr. Cleveland : would that not force the party to quit New York altogether and to seek a candidate elsewhere, and —in this event—where ? Mr. Gorman and Mr. Carlisle live on the wrong side of the line; and Mr. Morrison lacks the united support of Illinois. General Palmer has passed the age of promotion to party leadership. Of course Governor Pattison is possible, particularly if Pennsylvania goes Democratic in the fall elections ; whilst others, of whom we yet know nothing, may be "hid in the bushes." Hence it is that, unless the coming elections procure the Democrats something decisive in Ohio, Pennsylvania, or Iowa, the party will have to meet and dispose of the war between Cleveland and Hill, with a very scant margin of choice to go on when both are laid aside as unavailable; a contingency which, under the circumstances, seems not unlikely.

These suggestions are put forward in the way of the merest speculation. Touching them, one man's opinion is nearly as good as his neighbor's. A few weeks more will dispose of the most of them. But the faction fight in New York will not down so easily. It seems here to stay until the next National Convention at least, if not after. It is the one stumbling-block across the Democratic highway. If the party is beaten in 1892, it will owe its defeat largely, if not mainly, to this. Thinking Democrats cannot fail to regard it with apprehension, and disinterested Democrats must feel that, if it is not disposed of in some satisfactory way, the outlook for the next National Democratic Convention will be stormy indeed. Unhappily, New York politics, and the politics of the country at large, have very little assimilation, and hence external pressure exercises less influence upon New York than upon any other State of the Union. It is, so to say, a nation unto itself.

III.

A Tale of Two Leaders.

It will thus be seen that outside the State of New York the Democrats are in a complete fog for a candidate, whilst in the State of New York the contention for ascendency between two rival leaders has lashed the elements into a gale of the most threatening description.

It is understood that this family quarrel had its origin in matters chiefly personal and of no great import. But it may be doubted whether there was not back of these a set of irreconcilable conditions. New York is, and always has been, both strong and weak in national counsels,—strong because of her electoral vote; weak because of her dissensions.

The events which brought Mr. Cleveland to the Presidency and Mr. Hill to the Governorship abounded in much that is picturesque in American politics. If either had, in the outset, realized the strength of the other, the succeeding antagonism, so hurtful to both, might have been averted. But in the beginning the two were wholly undeveloped; and their development marks the date of their separation. Who could have foreseen that a man taken from the body of the people, and advanced to the Presidency without previous training in national affairs, would so soon and so firmly grasp the reins of power, seize the salient points of large ideas and current drifts of thought, and give to airy policies a definite purpose and phrasing? On the other hand, who could foresee that the comparatively unknown politician who had been left behind to administer, *ad interim*, home affairs until a successor was chosen, would himself appear as that successor, and easily so, winning repeated victories against odds, and building up an organization unequalled since the days of Mr. Tilden in his prime? That the Governor appreciated the President is more than likely; but there is no evidence that the President appreciated the Governor; and herein lies Mr. Cleveland's organic defect of character. He sets too much store by measures, too little by men.

One would hardly expect this in a man brought up in the school of the most every-day and commonplace affairs; who had been a sheriff and a mayor, and an all-around attorney in an interior city. It is related that Mr. Cleveland made a good sheriff and a good mayor, showing great assiduity and an unusual turn for details. He brought with him to the national capital these excellent gifts; but he soon added to them the display of an extraordinary self-confidence, particularly in one so unprepared, and a surprising taste for experimental politics, personal and practical. He cut and slashed right and left. In his hands precedents were scattered like cobwebs. His aim seemed to be to recreate the public service anew and after his own

image. He beat down opposition with a success startling to the discomfited. He made issues with a precipitation that staggered the doctrinaires. It is not denied by his enemies, partisan or personal, that he gave the country a wise, safe, and clean administration. But he lost his reëlection ; and the circumstances attending this loss lie at the bottom of the difference between him and Governor Hill, impairing the usefulness of both.

Governor Hill carried the State of New York as the Democratic nominee for Governor, and Mr. Cleveland lost it as the Democratic nominee for President. That is a concrete fact. If the two had been friends, it had been enough to threaten their relations ; but, being upon terms, to say the least of them, not very cordial, it formed the basis for immediate and for subsequent attacks upon the loyalty of Governor Hill wholly unjust to the Governor. The simple truth is that Mr. Cleveland lost the vote of New York on account of the friends he had chilled into indifference or converted into enemies, and that Governor Hill carried it because of a vote which might have been cast as well for Mr. Cleveland. Herein Governor Hill showed himself the better politician, not an unfriendly or unfaithful colleague ; for Mr. Cleveland was nowise ignorant of the situation. But whilst Governor Hill, with admirable energy and tact, pursued the methods common to all parties in the very mundane business of carrying elections, Mr. Cleveland, all unconscious of impending danger, his eye fixed upon the star of his destiny, was soaring through the clouds of great but intangible ideas.

IV.

THE COST OF TOO MUCH GREATNESS.

But Mr. Cleveland's loss of the Presidency, contradicting all theories about the successfulness of success, did not lose him the hold he had gained upon the confidence of the people. It strengthened it. There was a feeling among Democrats that he had, by brave and honest service to the country, earned his reëlection, and that in some way he had been cheated out of it. Naturally the disappointment was general, and the coincident election of Governor Hill fell in among other things with this disappointment. In a sense, it tarnished a glory Governor Hill had fairly won, and was made to create sympathy for Mr. Cleveland

and to reflect discredit on Governor Hill ; all most wrongfully. But here, it seems to me, Governor Hill failed to take a large and luminous view of the case.

The victim of circumstance can rarely quarrel effectually with circumstance. If he cannot make his peace with it, he had better acquiesce in it, or seem to acquiesce. Evidently Governor Hill is not a doctrinaire. He is a practical politician and he is a man ; and he disputed the imputation with more or less of spirit. The result is an apparently irreconcilable conflict, in which Mr. Cleveland and Governor Hill have everything to lose, and nothing to gain, whilst the party to which both claim allegiance is the sufferer.

If Governor Hill could have seen his way to it, the Democratic party and these two eminent party leaders would stand to-day upon much higher and solider grounds. It may not have been in human weakness, but it would have been in worldly wisdom, had the Governor recognized the fact that his election as Governor and Mr. Cleveland's defeat as President, on a common ticket, made his own succession to the Presidency uncertain. If there was between them an outstanding account, this balanced it, and Governor Hill could have afforded to make a sacrificial offer of an olive branch. Mr. Cleveland could not have refused. Indeed, it was eminently a case where sacrifice was sagacity and generosity prudence. It would have set at rest, and at once, all issues between leaders who were too strong to quarrel. It would have made them one in an irresistible movement, supported by the noblest popular enthusiasm. It might not, indeed, have ended in the election of Governor Hill to the Presidency,—though it would have taken that direction,—but it would have done more than this ; it would have made him a national leader and an unchallenged power among men. Without these attributes of popular leadership, the Presidency is the merest bauble, and, whilst Governor Hill is making himself strong in the State of New York, he is in reality doing his great talents for affairs injustice with the country at large.

In a word, these two party chiefs ought to see that they are wasting a vast amount of good fighting material. If each could take to himself a little of the other, both would be mended. As it is, the very advantages they may gain—the one in the country by the attractive side of his character and personality which he shows the masses ; the other in the State by his dextrous and

astute handling of local and muscular forces—work only evil to the cause that ought to be, and undoubtedly is, dear to them both. In the end they may find that they have lost all; for the Democratic party at large is growing very restive under New York turbulency, and it only wants a good pretext, and some one to head it, to throw off the dominion of the Empire State once and for all.

V.

THE DEMOCRATIC ISSUE.

Is it not, after all, the issue, and not the candidate, that counts in the election of a President? He was something more than a humorist who observed that by the time the personality of a presidential nominee was spread out over the whole country it grew rather thin! The immense popularity of Mr. Clay could not save him from defeat; and, in later times, the examples of General Hancock and Mr. Blaine point the same moral.

In the nature of things this must continue to be so, and more so; the question of availability, and not of individuality, occupying the first place in the thought of the nominating conventions. It seems to be the destiny of our republic to go on augmenting its grandeur and its power—already concentrated beyond the dreams of the most extreme federalism by the railway and the telegraph—until, a republic no longer except in name, its chief magistrates become mere types, chosen solely because of their representative character, and not because of any especial genius or fitness of their own.

The rival pretensions of Mr. Cleveland and Governor Hill, serious as they are and hard as they may be to settle, must yet be held by Democrats as of second-rate importance to the laying of the lines on which the next great political battle is to be fought.

If American statesmanship had any sequence to it, and parties were governed by any fixed, known, and reasonable laws, this question would have been determined by the defeat of Mr. Cleveland and the subsequent enactment of the McKinley Tariff Law. In 1888 the fight was made by the Democrats distinctly on the tariff. It was made, as the politicians say, "on principle." Those who made it gave reasons for the faith that was in them; and these reasons are as good now as they were then. They are better; because the McKinley Act is an intensification of all

which the advocates of revenue reform have held hurtful to the country. If its predecessor was bad, it is worse, and if it was wise and just to attack the former, it ought to be still wiser and more just to attack the latter.

In truth, the conflict between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff—between those who maintain that the government has no constitutional right of taxation except to raise the moneys needed for its own support, and those who maintain that taxation ought to be adjusted so as to favor certain classes and interests—is an irrepressible conflict. It constitutes an issue which will down at no man's bidding. Mr. Blaine's scheme of reciprocity, designed by that astute party leader at once as a flank movement against the Democrats and a bridge for free-trade Republicans, is a proclamation of weakness, a signal of distress, as notable as it is bold. Reciprocity is simply free trade in broken doses, and surrenders the whole case of protection as a dogma. But it will not serve the purpose of its author if the Democrats are equal to the emergency and to their duty. This latter is to stand by their guns and to fight it out on the line of 1888 until they have substituted a revenue tariff, on a peace footing, for the present protective tariff, with its high scale of war duties.

Just here we encounter an obstacle which ought to have no place in our party politics, and has none in the party politics of any other country. There is always from certain quarters a clamor for "more money," and at the present moment this takes the form of a demand for "more silver." The terms "free coinage" and "unlimited coinage" are trolled from stump to stump with a volubility only too significant of the absence of information, whilst resolution after resolution is passed by county meetings and district conventions from which an intelligent explanation might be sought in vain.

The question of coinage is a very complicated question. It is not national, but international. There is not, and never has been, any fixed relation between gold and silver. Our own coinage act is an experiment. Any amendment to it must be experimental. Those who talk the loudest commonly know the least. They ride the waves of popular prejudice unconscious of the depths below. A few simple, salient facts, however, are obvious. The country must have enough money to transact its business, and as the national-bank notes are withdrawn, they must be re-

placed by some form of circulating medium. Thus far silver or silver certificates have supplied this need, and the cry is "more." The debtor thinks that with "more" he can pay his debts. The creditor fears that "more" means merely a flood of debased money, and the loss or abridgement of his claim. Meanwhile the demagogue, with varying degrees of ignorance and resonance, divides his time between noisy extremism and confused hair-splitting, intelligible only to followers as ignorant and excited as himself.

During the last session of Congress the Force Bill gave a great impetus to the silver movement. By the aid of the silver Republicans in the Senate, the Democrats were enabled to defeat that obnoxious measure. Turn about proved, in this instance, fair play, and the result was that many Democrats voted for the Free-Coinage Act who could not have brought the consent of their judgment thereto as a detached or original proposition. As a consequence, we have a tolerably life-sized division of opinion on the subject within the Democratic party.

I do not believe that either side to this controversy is likely to get just what it expects. There is less to be feared by the one class, and to be hoped by the other, than they think. As usual, the mean, middle ground will be found safest, and in the end it will prevail. But, truly, if the skies should rain silver, if silver dollars should be heaped up in the valleys, so that those who are making such an ado about more money could fill their sacks and baskets, and could cart it away with them, it would, under our unequal tariff system, soon find its way back to the present custodians of the wealth of the country, leaving the tax-ridden farmer as poor as ever.

If the Democratic party allows an experimental question like this, a question on which we are not agreed, to make a breach for the Republicans to march through, and relegates to second place a great question like revenue reform, on which we have had our travail, and are at last united, it will meet defeat, and will richly deserve it.

But I do not believe anything of the sort. We shall in next year's National Convention find as to silver the same common ground that we found in 1884 as to the tariff. Then, as now, we were divided. Then, as now, we had to deal with a question for which we were not prepared, and to which the country was not edu-

cated. We shall repeat the wisdom of concession in 1892, leaving something and trusting something to the kindly offices of time. In that event we shall win; and, as a result of our victory, we can proceed with an unbroken line of enlightened and conservative reforms. In any other we shall lose; lose all hope of a liberal money policy and of revenue reform, gaining, as the first fruit of our folly, the Force Bill, and all the evils of another indefinite lease of power to a majority which, always domineering, will, if again triumphant, be more ruthless than ever.

HENRY WATTERSON.

"THE ECONOMIC MAN."

BY E. L. GODKIN.

WE HAVE been hearing during the past twenty years, and with greatly increased emphasis during the past ten, of the utter discredit which has overtaken the older political economy of Adam Smith, and Ricardo, and Mill, and Cairnes, and Say, and Cobden, and Bastiat. Their system, we have been told, is largely a deductive system, in which the premises are furnished by hypotheses which have no basis in the actual facts of industrial life, and are not verified either by experiment or observation. Not only are these premises not true of the world at large, but they are not true of any particular country in the world. They assume that the civilized world lives under the régime of competition, whereas there are only two or three countries which can be said, with any approach to accuracy, to do so. The "Economic Man" of Ricardo always buys in the cheapest markets, and always waits patiently until he can sell in the dearest, and he assumes that in so doing he renders the best service in his power to the community. Moral considerations do not, in any degree, affect his business transactions. There is no place in his system for brotherly kindness or charity. It is inexpedient for the state to attempt to regulate him in any way, either by keeping him out of the cheapest market or impeding his access to the dearest. All he asks of it is to be left alone to deal with his fellow men in such manner as his own natural acuteness or his command of capital may permit. His one desire is to make all the money he can by every means not illegal. *Laissez faire, laissez passez,* comprises the sole and whole duty of the state towards him.

Ricardo, who is the scapegoat who has to bear the burden of most of the sins of the old school, or who, at all events, figures most prominently in this discussion, has, it is said, built up his political economy on the desires and fears of an entirely mythical personage. For his "Economic Man" is not a real man,

This man does not represent the human race in general, or any particular part of it. He is a creature of the economist's imagination. The facts of human life have not entered into his composition. The old political economy—the "Smithianismus," as the Germans call it—has been based on the assumption that this economic man exists. It must be discarded when it is shown that he does not exist; that his assumed motives and activities are not the law of industrial communities. A new inductive political economy must, therefore, take the place of this old deductive one, and must be based on the observation and careful accumulation of the facts of industrial life in civilized countries, either as they now exist or as they are historically recorded. As the economic history of every country differs in some degree from that of every other country, it follows that every country must have its own political economy and its own staff of expounders of the local science.

This is, accordingly, what has happened. There have arisen a German school, an Austrian school, an English school, a Russian school, and an American school, which all differ in the matter of "method," but all agree in repudiating Adam Smith and his economic followers, in denouncing *laissez faire, laissez passez* as an economic rule, in being intensely "historical," and in endeavoring to supply morality to trade through some sort of government interference, not as yet clearly defined. The scorn of the new schools for Smith and Mill and Ricardo is indeed almost bitter, but their differences about "method"—that is, about the exact nature of the mental processes by which they reach their conclusions—are already nearly as numerous as those of the metaphysicians, and are apparently likely to prove as barren. If Comte, who first flouted the pretensions of political economy to be considered a science, were now living, these differences would please him hugely as illustrations of the soundness of his position. A little volume on "The Scope and Method of Political Economy," recently published by Mr. Keynes, the Lecturer on Moral Science in Cambridge University (England), should be read by any one who wishes to get an adequate idea not so much of economical methodology as of the methodological confusion which reigns among the economists. He remarks truly:

"Economic science deals with phenomena which are more complex and less uniform than those with which the natural sciences are concerned; and

its conclusions, except in their most abstract form, lack both the certainty and precision that pertain to physical laws. There is a corresponding difficulty in regard to the proper method of economic study, and the problem of defining the conditions and limits of the validity of economic reasoning becomes one of exceptional complexity. It is, moreover, impossible to establish the right of any one method to hold the field to the exclusion of others. Different methods are appropriate according to the materials available, the stage of investigation reached, and the object in view; hence arises the special task of assigning to each its legitimate place and relative importance." (P. 6.)

Still more pertinent is the following:

"The sharp distinctions drawn by opposing schools, and their narrow dogmatism, have unnecessarily complicated the whole problem. The subject has become involved in heated controversies that have not only made it wearisome to unprejudiced persons, but have also done injury to the credit of political economy itself. Outsiders are naturally suspicious of a science in the treatment of which a new departure is so often and so loudly proclaimed essential." (P. 8.)

This contempt for the "Economic Man" is the more remarkable because the members of the historic school themselves perforce make use of him. Roscher, who may be called the chief of it, relies on him fully as much as Ricardo. Such phrases as these abound in him:

"The systematic effort of *every* rational individual in his household management is directed towards the obtaining by a minimum of sacrifice of pleasure and energy a maximum satisfaction of his wants." (Vol. 1, pp. 60–66.) "The incentive to ameliorate one's condition is common to *all* men, no matter how varied the form, or how different the intensity of its imagination. It follows us *all* from the cradle to the grave. It may be restricted within certain limits, but is never *entirely* extinguished." "*All* normal economy aims at securing a maximum of personal advantage with a minimum of cost or outlay." (P. 73.) "Self-interest causes *every one* to choose the course in life in which he shall meet with least competition and the most abundant patronage." (P. 75.) "The abstraction according to which *all* men are by nature the same, different only in consequence of a difference of education, position in life, etc., *all* equally well equipped, skilful, and free in the matter of economic production and consumption, is one which, as Ricardo and Von Thunen have shown, must pass as an *indispensable stage* in the preparatory labors of political economists." (P. 105.) "The mathematical laws of motion operate in a hypothetical vacuum, and when applied are subject to important modifications in consequence of atmospheric resistances. Something similar is true of most of the laws of our science; as, for instance, those in accordance with which the price of a commodity is fixed by the buyer and seller. It also *always* supposes the parties to the contract to be guided *only* by a sense of their own best interest, and not to be influenced by secondary considerations." (P. 103.)*

The comparison of Ricardo's Economic Man to the first law of motion is an old one, but it is as good to-day as

* These quotations are all made from Lalor's translation.

when it was first made. It is quite true, as far as human knowledge goes, that no body actually continues for an indefinite period in rectilinear and uniform motion. But it is also true that no real progress would ever have been made in astronomy or mechanics without the assumption that if a body were set in motion in a vacuum this is the way in which it would move. It is no less true that political economy, no matter how defined, cannot be taught without assuming the existence of an Economic Man who desires above all things, and without reference to ethical considerations, to get as much of the world's goods as he can with the least possible expenditure of effort or energy on his own part. The fact that he is not humane or God-fearing no more affects his usefulness for scientific purposes than the fact that the first law of motion would carry a cannon ball through a poor man's cottage. The theory of production, of value, and of exchange, all rests on his assumed existence. He supplies the *raison d'être* of the whole criminal law and of a large part of the civil law of all civilized countries. Ethics, and religion in so far as it furnishes a sanction for ethics, exist for the purpose of deflecting him from his normal course. The well-known "Gresham's Law," which declares that the less valuable of two kinds of legal-tender money will drive the more valuable out of circulation, has been understood by some of our more ignorant bimetallists as meaning that one will exert some kind of mechanical pressure or chemical repulsion on the other. But "Gresham's Law" is simply a deduction from observation of the working of the Economic Man's mind when brought into contact with two kinds of currency of unequal value, and through our knowledge of the Economic Man we can predict its operation with almost as much certainty as the operation of a law of chemistry or physics.

Ethics and religion, in fact, constitute the disturbing forces which make possible the organization and prosperous existence of civilized states. They have to be calculated and allowed for and their working observed, just as the disturbing force of gravity, or atmospheric or other resistance, has to be calculated, allowed for, and its working observed, in astronomy or mechanics. But this calculation would be impossible if the constant tendency were known. If the Economic Man were blotted out of existence, nearly all the discussions of the economists would be as empty logo-

machy as the attempts to reconcile fixed fate and free will. That I am not here fighting a shadow is shown by the fact that General Francis A. Walker, himself an economist of eminence, in a recent address before the American Economic Association, on "The Tide of Economic Thought," gives the following as one of the reasons for the currency at this juncture of "the vaguest and wildest schemes for human regeneration upon an economic basis":

"First. The economists themselves are largely responsible for this state of things, on account of the arbitrary and unreal character of their assumptions and the haughty and contemptuous spirit in which they have too often chosen to deliver their precepts. Especially are our American economists sinners above the rest in these respects. Long after even the English economists, who have been lordly enough, Heaven knows! had *importantly modified the traditional premises of the science to meet the facts of human nature*, and had, with a wider outlook, admitted many extensive qualifications of the doctrine of *laissez faire*, the professors of political economy in the leading American colleges continued to write about the economic man of Ricardo and James Mill as if he was worth all the real men who ever lived; and the editors of the journals and reviews which especially affected to exercise authority in economics, greeted with contumely every suggestion of an exception to the rule of individualism, from whatever source proceeding, for whatever reason proposed. Even the complete establishment of such an exception in the policy of half a dozen nations, and its triumphant vindication in practical working to the satisfaction of all publicists, all men of affairs, and even of those who had once been selfishly interested to oppose it, constituted no reason why these high priests of economic orthodoxy should accept it."

I might, if I had space, take serious exception to these allegations about the teachings of professors in American colleges, on the score of exaggeration, and also to the proposition touching the satisfaction of "*all* publicists and *all* men of affairs," on the score of accuracy. But I am not concerned about this so much as about the statement that the English and other economists have "importantly modified the traditional premises of the science." We are sure that were General Walker debating any topic but political economy, in discussing which no man ever gets fully outside of his subject, he would at once recognize the fact that the premises of "a science" cannot be altered to suit any one's fancy or convenience. Science means the law which regulates the succession of phenomena. Scientific investigation means an attempt by observation or experiment, or both, to get at this law. But it is only in theology or metaphysics that the scientific investigator creates his own premises, and makes hypotheses which account for nothing. In all other fields, political economy in-

cluded,—if it be a science,—the premises are furnished not by the logician, but by the phenomena of nature. Human society furnishes the economist with his phenomena, and therefore with his premises. He can, if he be a scientific man, no more modify them "importantly" or otherwise than he can by taking thought add a cubit to his stature. He can, of course, as in any line of investigation, frame hypotheses, but the hypotheses have to be verifiable by observation or experiment. But under all circumstances, and for all purposes, there is no getting away from the phenomena. You may dislike them, or wish they were otherwise, but accept them you must. You may approach them inductively by collecting on them for your premises, or you may approach them deductively by concocting a hypothesis or theory to explain them, but you must still apply them promptly to your conclusion to see whether they fit. I venture to assert that there is not a single economist of the old school, beginning with Adam Smith, who, as a scientific man, has not used both these methods with such success as his diligence and skill permitted. But in all economic investigation the first inquiry is, and, so far as it is economical, must forever remain: What will the Economic Man do when brought in contact with certain selected phenomena of the physical or social world? And the more complicated the facts of the industrial and social world are, the more necessary to the economist the Economic Man is, in order to enable him to steer his way through the maze.

The existing confusion in the economic world, which General Walker's charge, quoted above, well illustrates, is due, apparently, to difficulty in getting the members of the new or historical schools to tell us in what character they appear. One can never tell, in listening to them, whether they are addressing us as scientific men or statesmen. Their air of authority is that of scientists, but the eager philanthropy of their utterances indicates that they are really would-be legislators. Their clothes are economical, but their talk is ethical. To take Roscher again as an example of the best-known and most moderate of them, one finds that what he has added to the work of the older economists, besides the illustrations supplied by an enormous erudition, consists mainly of theology and metaphysics. The new schools profess to know far more about the will of God, and about duty and the moral sources of happiness, and the ethical foundations of the state,

than the older economists; but they have not contributed anything of practical importance to our knowledge of the laws of value, of production, or of exchange, as extracted from the mind of the producer and purchaser. The test of science is that it enables one to predict consequences. Until our researches have enabled us to foresee exactly what will happen if something else happens, although we may have discovered valuable and interesting facts, we have not discovered a law. That the historical school have laid before us a large mass of interesting information about the industrial condition of various countries at various periods cannot be denied, but I am unable to see in what their contributions to economical literature differ from the books of intelligent and observant travellers. Their great objection to the policy of *laissez faire*—that it permits a considerable amount of cruelty, oppression, and suffering, and that, in spite of its teachings, poverty exists on a great scale among the laboring classes—is an ethical or political, not a scientific, objection. It is simply saying to the rich what "the Society for the Abolition of Poverty" says—that they are cruel or unjust. It does not suggest any economical mode, in the scientific sense of the term, for improving the condition of the poor.

Take as an example of our meaning General Walker's announcement, in the passage we have just quoted, of "the complete establishment" of "an exception to the rule of individualism" (we presume the regulation of factory labor) "in the policy of half a dozen nations" "to the satisfaction of all publicists, all men of affairs," etc. This exception, let us observe, was first made in the country which has been supposed to be most influenced by the individualists. But no matter what its merits, or what its results, the fact remains that it is not an exception in the economic sense. It is a political or social measure, not an economic one. It is not a conclusion of economic science. It is a dictate of humanity or physiology or religion. It is a police regulation, to which the Economic Man is no more opposed than to the restrictions on the use of public water or the municipal prohibition of the storing of gunpowder. It was opposed in the beginning not by economists, but by manufacturers who happened to be at the time strongly combating the kind of government interference with production which had been the rule in Europe ever since the middle ages. There is no foundation for the suggestion that in any six countries in the world the Economic Man has offered any se-

rious impediment to the kind of special interference with distribution for the benefit of the race which is known as socialistic legislation. The legislation has, as a matter of fact, begun earliest in England, where individualism has been supposed to be most powerful, and has gone on *pari passu* with the spread of the opinions associated with the name of Smith and Ricardo and Cobden. The only effect of these opinions on English legislation has been to abolish the former hindrances to exchange with foreign countries; and those who advocated this have certainly not been brought to shame by the resulting effect on the national industry and on the condition of the working classes.

In short, the new school of economists are rather politicians, using the word in its good sense, than scientific men. What mainly occupies them is legislation for taking away money from capitalists and distributing it among laborers. The earlier school may have paid too much attention to the problem of production. The later ones can hardly be said to pay any attention at all to production. With the effect of their plans on production—that is, on the dividend which the earth yields every year to the labor of its inhabitants—they hardly seem to concern themselves. To talk of their championship of the working classes as being in any sense scientific would be an abuse of language.

And I cannot help thinking that General Walker's ascription of the existing currency "of the vaguest and wildest schemes for human regeneration on an economic basis" to the economists —meaning by that the followers of Ricardo and Mill—is a curious misapprehension. It reads very like the criticism of the wolf on the lamb's pollution of the water. If dates throw any light on the matter, "the wild and vague schemes for human regeneration upon an economic basis" did not begin to spread or take hold of any civilized community with marked force or effect until after the convention of the "Katheder Socialisten" in Germany in 1877, and the appearance of the historical school in Germany, England, and America. Professor Ingram's attack on political economy in general in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" undoubtedly gave somewhat of a blow to "Smithianismus," but he only repeated what Comte had already said of the absurdity of supposing that there could be any such thing as economical science apart from the general science of sociology. He, however, greatly diminished the apparent value of the Economic Man, and helped

to start crowds of young professors and labor agitators and politicians in search of a new economy which would shorten hours of labor, raise wages, humble the employer, give the laborer a fair share in the luxuries of life, and eventually abolish poverty.

The progress of this *quasi*-scientific movement towards social regeneration through government interference, of the discredit of the older economists, and of the resulting economic confusion of which General Walker speaks, has been hastened by two other agencies of which he takes no notice. The charge that this confusion has been brought about through the bad manners of the old economists, and the hard-and-fast way in which they presented their theories to the multitude, shows that it is not science but politics which has been expected of them. The fact—if it be a fact—that the multitude refuses to listen to them any longer, and has gone off to worship new gods, does not prove that they have reasoned wrongly on the facts of society. It simply proves that their conclusions are unpopular. That a certain number of persons have gone into "the vaguest and wildest schemes for human regeneration on an economic basis" does not show that the assumptions of the old economists have been "arbitrary and unreal," although it may show that their precepts have been delivered in a "haughty and contemptuous spirit." But judging these economists as legislators, which is really what the new school does, it is impossible to decide, on any data now in our possession, whether the *laissez-faire* system, as it is called, has been, or will be, successful or not. There is, unhappily, no absolute test of success in economic legislation. All that the wisest legislator can look for as a sign of his success in dealing with economic problems is a reduction in the amount of discontent among the poor. To abolish discontent among the poor completely, in any country, is as hopeless a task as to abolish poverty, and no statesman attempts it. Whether he has succeeded in lessening discontent he can only ascertain approximately, by means of an inference from the increase of consumption as shown in statistics collected from various sources. He concludes, *à priori*, that the poor are less discontented when they consume more of the necessaries and luxuries, because he has observed that, as a rule, physical comfort among the great bulk of mankind tends to produce happiness; but no economist can say with certainty that any particular kind of economical

legislation is the best possible, or has produced effects which no other kind would or will produce. It is here that the complexity of all sociological problems comes in to baffle the politician, and compels him, in the vast majority of cases, to legislate simply for the Economic Man, with whose needs and tendencies he is, as a rule, far more familiar than he is with the needs of the ethical man. So that if the new schools of political economy enter the field, as they are apparently doing, not as scientists, but as legislators, their attacks on the old one as politicians cannot have any better basis than pride of opinion. It remains to be seen whether their plans for the promotion of human happiness are in any way superior to those of the old school or not.

It seems to be forgotten that the paternal system of government, in which what is called "the state" plays the part of an earthly parent to the individual, has been tried on an extensive scale in various communities and at various periods of the world's history, and with very poor success. I grant that it has not been tried under conditions as favorable as those which now exist. The experiment may now be made with greatly improved administrative machinery, with minute as well as wide knowledge of economic facts and tendencies, and under the watch of a powerful public opinion. But, on the other hand, the state has lost completely, in the eyes of the multitude, the moral and intellectual authority it once possessed. It does not any longer represent God on earth. In democratic countries it represents the party which secured most votes at the last election, and is, in many cases, administered by men whom no one would make guardians of his children or trustees of his property. When I read the accounts given by the young lions of the historical school of the glorious future which awaits us as soon as we get the proper amount of state interference with our private concerns for the benefit of the masses, and remember that in New York "the state" consists of the Albany Legislature under the guidance of Governor Hill, and in New York city of the little Tammany junta known as "the Big Four," I confess I am lost in amazement. I ask myself, How can anybody who attacks the old school with such vigor for its indifference to the facts of daily life be so completely oblivious of that most patent fact, that the capacity of the state

for interfering with people profitably has not grown in anything like the same ratio as the popular intelligence, and that there is nothing in which modern democracy is showing itself so deficient as in the provision of inspecting machinery—that is, in securing the faithful execution of its plans for the promotion of popular comfort?

The agencies which have really done most to discredit the older political economy with the masses, and to produce an efflorescence of wild schemes of social regeneration on an economic basis, are, as I have said, two in number. The first is the extravagant expectations about the powers of the state in the solution of economical problems raised by the historical school since its appearance in 1877. Its promises and denunciations have been flung into democratic communities in which, as in France, Germany, and England, the poorer classes were just becoming aware of the extent of the power over the government which universal suffrage had put into their hands. In no country have "the masses," in the modern sense of that term, ever been greatly concerned about political liberty, as the men of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in this country and England understood it and fought for it; that is, about the division of the sovereignty between different bodies so as to prevent the growth of arbitrary power. The greatest political interest of that vast majority of the human race which is in but a small degree removed from want always has been, and probably always will be, the power of legislation over distribution. A good government always has been to them a government under which trade is brisk, wages are high, and food is cheap. The reason why the older political economy has seemed to them "a dismal science" has been that its teachings, in so far as it attempted to teach, discouraged reliance on the state for these things, and made the attainment of them dependent on individual character. I am not now discussing whether this doctrine was or was not pushed too far; I simply say that it was the most natural thing in the world for the working classes of England, for example, which had been so long familiar with legislation for the direct benefit of the middle and upper classes, to receive with anger or suspicion the announcement that the care of any class by the state was a mistake, and that individual independence was the true rule of industrial life. When these classes, there-

fore, found themselves invested through the suffrage with political power, it was inevitable that they should seek at once to improve their condition through legislation, and should receive with acclamation the news that a new school of political economy had been founded which taught as "science" that the politicians were the true fathers of their country, and would, on application, put an end to unjust distribution. In short, the new departure which the new schools are all calling for is a new departure in politics, not in political economy. There is hardly a trace of science in their talk any more than in that of city missionaries. What they are asking us to do is simply to try a hazardous experiment in popular government.

The second agency in producing the existing economic confusion, which, as it appears to me, General Walker overlooks, is the substitution in nearly all the churches of the "gospel of social endeavor," as it has been called, for the old theological gospel. There are very few clergymen to-day who venture to expound in their pulpits what was formerly called the "Queen of the Sciences," the science of Christian theology. This used to be their chief business. Of this science they were the acknowledged masters. They were supposed to have the key to the greatest of all earthly problems, and their contentions with each other over the proper solution of it furnished the chief interest of the intellectual world in all countries. When Dr. Lyman Beecher took the charge of a group of "anxious inquirers" out of the hands of Judge Gould at Litchfield, he did so as a professional man, just as a physician would have taken a case of typhoid fever out of the hands of an apothecary, and the church saw clearly the overwhelming necessity of the judge's deposition. Probably nine out of ten of the members to-day would smile over the good doctor's notion that his skill in dealing with spiritual suffering was, *ex officio*, any greater than the judge's. In fact, authority has departed from the pulpit as a profession. Everybody nowadays acknowledges this, and clergymen feel it. They feel especially that they have failed in obtaining influence for revealed religion over the great masses of population congregated in modern cities, and yet it is these masses which have raised what is called the "labor problem," and have produced the prodigious economic tumult which the historical school is trying to allay.

That ministers who feel that the old gospel has lost its power

to soothe discontent and to account for social evils, should endeavor to get at the point of view of the laboring poor, and should in a large number of cases, through force of sympathy, come to share in their illusions touching the power of government over distribution, is surely very natural. The socialist view of what social arrangements ought to be is very much like that of the early Christians, and the clergyman's imagination is naturally touched by finding it held by large bodies of his contemporaries. Moreover, was not the world once conquered by an ethical idea, and what is easier than for an ardent preacher to believe that it is not too late to do it over again? It has been maintained in this city in a clerical convention within twenty years, in all seriousness, that the whole world might be, and probably would be, with proper effort, "converted," in the technical sense of that term, within thirty years. What is there very wonderful in the opinion that this conversion might be hastened by a rearrangement, under government superintendence, of the relations of labor and capital?

Moreover, the notion that the economists are to blame for the aberrations of "the benevolent clergymen, ecstatic ladies," and other "prophets and disciples of an industrial millennium," would be more plausible if an industrial millennium were anything new, or if, from the days of Hesiod to our own, the evils of man's condition had not been laid on the greed of the rich, on the pride of the wise and learned, and on the inhumanity of the great, by a long catena of poets, sages, and prophets. That the volume of social discontent is now greater than in former ages is due mainly to the multitude of new problems we have to face, to the immensely improved means of spreading ideas, to the wonderful economic changes effected by science and invention, and, though last not least, to the appearance on the scene of the new schools of political economy to preach the limitlessness of the province of government. But the labor problem remains very much what it has been ever since agriculture was substituted for hunting and fishing—a problem which, in the main, each man must solve for himself.

E. L. GODKIN.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

FREAKS OF LAW.

THE absurdities of special legislation may prove its disintegrating force quite as much as the earnestness with which its errors are combated. The self-confident ease with which the panacea of special laws is invoked for a multitude of ills has such a sublime effrontery that it becomes ludicrous; and as Americans contrive loopholes of escape from obedience, reformers now not only ask for new laws, but demand that a penalty shall be attached to each law to insure its efficacy.

Special legislation is the Mecca of philanthropy. On its behalf the lobby is employed with edifying zeal. Churches, societies, monopolies, boards, officials, tinker legislation. Organizations multiply, on the ground that if such a noble body of men and women as each society considers itself determines upon or even approves certain legislation, such surely will be enacted. Annual reports teem with congratulation upon the legal improvements effected at the suggestion of secretaries and presidents, and ministers in their legislative prayers become as embarrassed as old Dr. Ezra Ripley, who prayed that the Lord would overrule every one of the decisions of the court, when he merely wished that in a general way God would rule over the hearts of the people.

Individuals cheat themselves with the delusion that they are patriotic because they offer their misfortunes as indications of the need for special laws. Therefore Mrs. Royle and Mrs. Lucas sought for divorce, each premising that a new law should be framed for her case, as her contribution to the cause of womanhood; and when informed that the general laws of Massachusetts were sufficient for their purpose, each returned to her husband and continued to bake pies for him.

Petitions for legislation are as astounding in number as they are varied in scope. Last winter an extraordinary one was introduced into the Indiana Legislature—that chairmen of the committee on bills in third reading should be rewarded by a double salary. What a slur it involved upon other members, who, if it had passed, would have been stigmatized as not doing their duty! Illinois has always been famous for its peculiar statutes. It offers bounties as encouragement to agricultural fairs and other industries. Its legislature was besought to incorporate a company for the detection of horse-thieves, when the usual processes of law were adequate for the discovery of such thefts and the conviction of the offenders. In emulation of the West, Maine asked Congress for $100,000 with which to build a breakwater at Bar Harbor, which, if granted, would have been of notable benefit to yachtsmen

and the wealthy cottagers of Mount Desert. As atonement Maine granted a bounty of ten cents per head for dead crows, to the delight of the small boys, who were aggrieved at the penalty imposed upon the sale of cigarettes to them.

A few of the late bills in the Massachusetts Legislature show to what extent special measures might have been carried, and though "inexpedient to legislate" was reported on many of them, the people's money and the members' time were given to earnest debates upon them. An act was reported compelling idle persons to work for those dependent on them. If it had passed, the proverbial Satan and the State would have been rival employers. Another act was offered for the arrest of transgressors by the Fish Commissioners without a warrant. If enacted, the act would have been of flagrant injustice to all other commissioners and an insult to the general law. An act was on the calendar providing a fine for catching trout less than six inches in length. The act should have been differently drawn; for how could boys tell how long the trout were until they were hooked? Philadelphia and Massachusetts farmers are at constant war with each other concerning "the removal of heads, entrails, and feathers of poultry exposed for sale." Apart from the sanitary aspect of the matter, if Philadelphia market-men take them out, they will have to charge so much more per pound, that people may then be willing to buy the inferior Bay State fowl.

A curious instance of unnecessary (!) beneficent special legislation was the passing of a bill by which the travelling expenses of deaf pupils attending the schools or institutions for the deaf shall be paid by the Commonwealth, though voluntary payment of the whole or any part of them is graciously permitted. Why should not the travelling expenses of the blind, and also of their guides, likewise be paid? Consequently other charitable persons attempted to pass a bill exempting from taxation the property of blind persons to the amount of $5,000!

The Weavers' Fine Bill has long been a contest between the manufacturer's clemency and his employees' capacity. If the imposition of fines had continued, lady customers might have followed suit, revenging themselves for their ill-fitting dresses by withholding the amount due on a dressmaker's bill until the suits were worthy of their approval. The State also was requested not to vie with the powers of nature in permitting the pursuit of wild fowl by aid of a sailboat or steam-launch.

Discontent and envy have much to do with the eight-hour movement. A genuine American always wants to be as well off as his neighbor. Failing therein, he would reduce to a common standard all the varied applications of ability and labor. When the eight-hour law is turned upon domestic service, he may then regret its agitation. If laws are necessary for the protection of children, there should be no interference by law with the greater or less capacity for labor by adult men or women. Few women desire protection, though those connected with certain organizations are forced to accept it; but surely any eight-hour bill should guarantee the rights of freemen to individual contract.

Legislation in regard to education veers from state socialism to local individualism. Wisconsin would make its Board of Education autocratic, but in Massachusetts the Committee on Education reported against establishing a new board of examiners to supervise all schools, because such a bill savored of centralization. Snobbish ignorance might rejoice in seeing Harvard College supervised, but Boston culture would regret it. Other persons

want the State to sign contracts for the publication of certain text-books. If the bill making cities and towns liable for injuries received by pupils attending the public schools had passed, private schools would have labored under greater disadvantages than at present. A jealous regard for the authority of town and county school committees and superintendents also prevented the passage of a bill by which any teacher, on voluntarily presenting herself for examination, as prescribed by the State Board of Education, and passing it, could receive a corresponding diploma.

No legislative freaks are queerer than those which undertake to settle by the permanence of law that which should be left to the development of personal good will and forbearance; but as railroads feared the economic loss involved in the principle of *noblesse oblige*, a law was enacted to prevent the letting-down of upper berths when not in use.

Appeals are also made to law to settle the social status of people. An Italian society in Boston protested against "wealthy Italians being permitted to collect garbage," arguing that the business should be restricted to poor persons. America, however, is outranked by the "English United Chimney-Sweeps' Protective Association," which complained to Parliament that any man of bad character or "without experience" might be employed as a sweep, and requested that no one should sweep a chimney without being registered or certificated. Because there is to be a bill before the German Reichstag to abolish bachelorhood in the interest of unmarried women, should not our Eastern States, on behalf of our Western men, enact laws to avert spinsterhood in New England? The logic of state socialism is pitiless; marriage conditions dictated, regulation of birth follows. Suicide will next be forbidden, with a penalty attached to its practice, which absent-minded people will believe in with sincerity equal to that of the lawyer who, on going to his office, read his own notice that he would soon return and sat down and waited for himself!

The abolition of bad statutes, not the enactment of beneficiary ones, is needed. Reformers ask for special laws which handicap the development of character into national strength. Paternalism is not the highest attitude of the State. It is proposed to stop by law the early closing of shops. That checks business. No matter, perhaps, for the dealer in boots and shoes, but bad for the cobbler. It is hoped to destroy by law the sweating system. It will take more than Pinkerton's detectives to do that. Yet why look to legislation for reforms which should be accomplished by personal energy and chivalry in a country where each man should have the fullest liberty compatible with the liberties of others? We owe ourselves to the State, which owes us no reward in turn unless we earn it, while the line in legislation can only be drawn by an historic study of sequences, by classification of broad human interests, and by prophetic insight into results of present action.

KATE GANNETT WELLS.

"APOLLEIA"—A PROPHECY.

THE group of asteroids which seem to fill the place in the solar system between Mars and Jupiter suggested to an ingenious modern writer the fanciful tale of an exploded world (Apolleia), of which those "pocket-planets," as Herschel calls them, are the fragments.

In intellectual development the inhabitants of that hapless world had advanced far beyond the inhabitants of our earth. Their mastery over the forces of nature was not confined to harnessing steam and lightning, producing what practically amount to new species of both plants and animals, bringing down the rain at pleasure, or such small matters. They sailed the air as we sail the ocean; they made rivers, seas, harbors, islands, mountains, valleys, when and where they pleased; if a coast-line was not to their fancy, they changed it; if a continent was too large, they reduced it; if too small, they enlarged it; deserts, steppes, and vast marshes they transformed to blooming gardens and fruitful fields. In short, they dethroned nature and usurped her proud sovereignty. But at last their vaulting ambition o'erleapt itself.

Some daring De-Lesseps-and-Edison-in-one, of that highly-developed race, conceived the magnificent project of tunnelling the planet, and thus achieving the *ne plus ultra* of rapid transit between the antipodes. In Apolleia no scheme was so daring, so impious, as to be "ahead of the times." The new idea was welcomed with enthusiasm and delight. The grand engineering operations began. Gigantic machines ripped and tore into the bowels of the planet; floods of chemicals dissolved soil and rock with equal potency. The work was rapidly approaching completion when—

Apolleia was no more!

Now, though plain, matter-of-fact science repudiates the fascinating theory that the asteroids are the fragments of an exploded planet, the pretty story built upon that theory is not without its practical suggestions.

Rapid progress involves a corresponding shortening of processes. The child who ardently wishes he were lifted at once to the plane of full manhood simply yearns for a closer proximity to death.

For long years the century-plant grows slowly, unfolding frond by frond with monotonous regularity. All at once it awakens to tremendous action. The vitality which has been accumulating during all those decades suddenly leaps forth. Hours do the work of years. A tree-like stalk shoots up into the air, blossoms luxuriantly, and—presto—the splendid plant is dead! That green tower was its Babel: after it the deluge.

For unknown ages the earth was a seed unplanted. For unknown ages it germinated and grew. For a few short hundreds or thousands of centuries mankind, its tower of strength and vitality, has been rising. These last years are outdoing the work of previous ages.

Is the earth approaching the period of its luxuriant blossoming?

Is the story of Apolleia a prophecy?

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

ARITHMETIC AND THE BACCARAT CASE.

I SEE it announced that Sir William Gordon Cumming may be expected to visit the United States shortly. Doubtless this will revive the interest of Americans in a recent trial as to the results of which no slight differences of opinion seem to exist in England. Permit me, therefore, to point out one aspect of this curious case which seems to have escaped attention. I mean the coldly arithmetical aspect of the now historic game of baccarat played at Tranby Croft.

These games were played for money. The surest way—indeed, the only sure way—to ascertain whether they were fairly or unfairly played, obviously

was to look into the financial results of the games. If an arithmetical inquiry shows that one or another player left off with more or less winnings than for the number and amount of his stakes he was honestly entitled to have, fraud would have to be inferred; but it could only be proved after it had been defined, and it could only be defined after a rigid analysis of the games, stakes, and winnings. The tableaux (or statements of each player's operations) of the two nights alone could make this analysis possible, with the number of events (an "event" being a completed "hand"), the surplus of winnings, and the average stakes of the players. Applying to these tableaux this analysis, we should have had the *corpus delicti*. As it was, the whole proceedings from beginning to end were like an inquiry as to the guilt of a murderer before the fact was fully established that a murder had been committed! What is the tale of Tranby Croft as it was actually worked out and left at the close of the trial from the point of view of arithmetic and of the laws of evidence?

Sir William Gordon Cumming, playing baccarat at the same table with young Mr. Wilson for two consecutive nights (the Prince of Wales being dealer, and therefore playing against Wilson and Sir William), left off, after a series of thirteen events, with £225 of winnings, of which £75, we are told, was due, not to winnings on the table of Sir William and Wilson, but to "by-bets" on the other tables. This gives £150 as the amount won and held by Sir William as the outcome of thirteen "events" at the Wilson-Cumming table. Five reputable persons, out of a larger number present and looking on, state, and, it is admitted, sincerely believe, that during these games they, among them, saw Sir William on thirteen occasions, by four different methods, add to his stake after an event. They also state that these additions amounted in all to £105. No two of these five persons, however, state that they saw the same act of addition on his part. The Prince, who was the banker throughout, and therefore held to protect his own stakes, does not state that he saw any fraud on any one of these thirteen occasions; nor does any other person present, except the afore-mentioned five, state that he or she saw any.

Mr. Wilson, one of the five persons who state that they saw Sir William add to his stakes, staked on the same cards with Sir William at the same table. He states that, playing low, he left off with £50 or £60 to the good. He states that Sir William, playing higher, left off—honestly or dishonestly—with £150 to the good.

Therefore the proportion between the stakes of Mr. Wilson and Sir William must be the proportion between their winnings, and there must be for each an average stake. This is not a question of eyesight, but of arithmetic. If in the thirteen instances of alleged cheating the original stake of Sir William was £5, he must have honestly won £65. But by adding £105 of alleged fraudulent additions to £65 we do not get £150; and if we accept Mr. Wilson's statement that *his* winnings were from £50 to £60, it is impossible to work out an average stake for him from £1 up to £5 which will avoid the discrepancy. Nor are we helped by Mr. Wilson's further statement that he "saw but cannot specify" other cheating. If he did, every counter added would make the discrepancy wider between what Sir William on the hypothesis of cheating must have had and what upon the evidence he did have. In a play of three or four hours a certain number of events must have happened with a surplus of winnings for Sir William and Mr. Wilson to put Mr. Wilson from £50 to £60 to the good.

If the average stake of Wilson was £2, the surplus of winnings was £26. If the average stake of Sir William was £5, he could not, as we find he said to the Prince, showing his tableau, help winning. He must have won from £125 to £150. The known winnings of Sir William, £65, must be reduced to £45 to make the allegation that he fraudulently added £105 tally with the £150 we are told he actually had. To reduce the £65 to £45, the times the table won must be reduced from thirteen, as testified by Wilson, to nine. But then nine surplus winnings will not account for the £50 to £60 which, we are told, Wilson had! If before or after the thirteen specified instances Sir William played the *coup de trois*, he either lost or won on the aggregate of the *coups*. If he lost, Mr. Wilson could not win, nor could his £50 to £60 be accounted for. If he won, Sir William must have had more than £65. If he stood even, the position was unchanged. Given Mr. Wilson with a lower stake, who comes out with from £50 to £60, Sir William with a higher stake, who comes out with £150, and given Sir William's thirteen admitted stakes of £5 each admittedly winning £65, it is arithmetically impossible so to construct the game as that £105 out of £150 shall be the product of cheating, because the surplus winnings of the table must be exactly thirteen, or more or less. If more, Sir William honestly wins more; if exactly thirteen, or less, Wilson cannot win from £50 to £60.

These are the arithmetical difficulties which have occurred to me in connection with this strange story, and which I give for what they are worth.

ARITHMETICIAN.

THE FALLACY OF PATRIOTISM.

BY POPULAR judgment, patriotism is considered a primary virtue, of the same value as truth and honesty; and so well is this view established that few attempt to reason on the subject, and to doubt it is generally to invite contempt or abuse.

The virtue is asserted, not proved. The child is taught to shout with delight when the flag is raised, to exalt the form of government under which he was born, and to overlook serious faults both in its formation and in its administration. The peculiar genius of our people also causes the bosom to swell with patriotic pride; and we exult in the contemplation of our natural resources and beauties. Foreign nations may well be despised, their people graded as parvenus or trash, their government held in contempt; and while it may not be possible to dispute that they have some natural beauties, it must not be admitted that nature elsewhere can compare with the domestic article. That would be unpatriotic.

Patriotism is like dogmatism in religion. The latter claims absolute truth, with none existing apart from its teachings; while patriotism is a blind admiration for one's own surroundings, and a denial of the possibility of equal good existing elsewhere.

The claim that patriotism is a virtue would be difficult to maintain. Virtue is moral excellence, and while it might, perhaps, be shown that patriotism, under certain conditions, has some merit, it would be hard to satisfy a thinking man that the love of one's native land has any connection with the practice of goodness or the possession of morality. If it were possible, it would be still more difficult to show how an Englishman could display any particular morality by being a patriotic Briton one year, and display the

same virtue by renouncing his allegiance to Queen Victoria and becoming a patriotic American the succeeding year. Virtue should be the study of every man. He should aim to live a life of moral excellence, and in this study all assumed or pretended virtues should be closely examined. If patriotism is found wanting, it should be unhesitatingly repudiated.

The boundary lines of nations are of human invention, and are not set by the Creator. They are matters of agreement, either by councils or by force of the conqueror, and, in consequence, the patriotic soul is sometimes at a loss—without a thorough geographical knowledge, or the presence of a custom-house official to remind him that he is crossing the line—to know where his love shall end and perfect indifference begin.

Alsace and Lorraine have alternately been French and German, requiring the citizen to change the object of his love. The map of Europe is constantly being altered, and the changed map of North America may yet impose upon the patriotic Canadian the duty of transferring the exercise of this so-called virtue to another government. One who is really seeking to know virtue becomes bewildered at the quality of the moral excellence, directing the emotions of transplanted patriots in the exercise of patriotic feelings towards their latest government.

Virtue is not climatic, nor can that passion be properly designated a virtue which fills the mind with feelings of love to everything on one side of an imaginary line, and perfect indifference to everything on the other side, solely because of different existing forms of government. Spencer says that "patriotism is nationally what egoism is individually." Every one can recall instances in which self-glorification has marred characters which otherwise would have been exemplary. But how much greater is the evil when the people of a nation collectively indulge in it! Our admirable qualities should not be constantly announced. Let them be seen without advertisement. Local conceit, so much admired at home, so admirable in one's own country, cannot be successfully transplanted.

The man who proclaims his patriotism away from home, where national love is for another flag, another government, makes himself a nuisance, both by the announcement of his country's excellences and by his enthusiastic appreciation of them. Yet his appreciation is patriotism, the great virtue. The cultivated man, however, though he may be a slave of this time-honored and musty habit, is silent on his country's greatness when abroad, be he English or American. If patriotism is a virtue, it is the only one that becomes a noxious fungus by change of scene and climate. Justifiable wars (if such there be) have been commenced solely because injustice or wrong was being done. They have too often been needlessly protracted by the patriotic spirit, and the memory of them, which should have been blotted out, has been kept alive to keep patriotism at the boiling-point. One would think that not only were nations made great and the people made happy by fighting, but that it was more important for nations to be great than for the people to be happy.

The popular orator, when fully primed with patriotism, revives the recollection of carnage and slaughter, the acts of the perpetrators, and the sufferings of the victims. Dean Swift's aphorism, that "the real benefactor is the man who makes two blades of grass to grow where but one grew before," is ignored unless the hearers happen to be voting agriculturists. Count Tolstoï, whose early life was spent in war, says: "When I think of all the evils I have endured and seen, arising from national animosities, I see

that it is all due to that gross imposture, love of one's native land." Macaulay says: "An exclusive attachment to a particular society, though a natural and under certain restrictions a useful sentiment, implies no extraordinary attainment in wisdom or virtue." The admirer of peace finds little in patriotism to arouse his best emotions. He is content to do justice and love mercy.

Few sentences have become so hackneyed as Webster's words, "Our country, may she always be right; but our country, right or wrong!" When the virtue under consideration calls for such immoral support as these lines teach us to give, it is time to examine it closely and see if there is any virtue in a sentiment that demands the support of the wrong. Herbert Spencer gives a gentle reproof to the indorser of Webster's view: "Whoever entertains such an opinion has not that moral equilibrium of feeling required for dealing scientifically with social phenomena." In fact, the unequivocal patriot must be blind.

The persistent claim is that patriotism is not only an admirable virtue, but a necessity for the nation's welfare; that without it governments would have but poor support, and, lacking the enthusiastic admiration of the citizens, would be unstable. The support given anything by enthusiasm is uncertain. Really strong support is that given by the cool, clear-headed man who seeks justice and desires peace and plenty for all. The Declaration of Independence was the demand of men who simply wanted justice done, much less concerned about building up a strong government than securing to citizens their rights. The idea of a strong government drawing its support from the bubbling patriotism of the people runs counter to the declaration that government derives its powers from consent of the governed. Government should have no strength that the people do not willingly allow it to have.

A proclaimed virtue should in our day draw some support from the teachings of Christianity; but in patriotism one looks for it in vain. In fact, Christianity appealed to the world with power because it broke down the partition between Jew and Gentile, and proclaimed that God had made all men of one blood to dwell on the earth, and that all men were brethren. This thought clashes with patriotism, and, when accepted as Christian teachings should be, raises a barrier to patriotism; for men of one blood, brethren, should have no jealousies or animosities towards each other. Greatness, too, knows no national lines. The world claims the great of all nations; their place of nativity is a mere accident. Goodness is apart from sectionalism. To quote Spencer again, "The moral law is cosmopolite, and no respecter of nationalities, and between men who are the antipodes of each other in locality or anything else, there must still exist the same balance of rights as though they were next-door neighbors."

It would follow that the man who admires greatness, and seeks the attainment of goodness and virtue, cannot find any place for patriotism. He cannot concentrate his love on the place where he happens to be born, or the government that he found preserving order and guarding his natural rights. To be in sympathy with the world's great minds, the seeker after truth must not be hampered by an imaginary line. Emerson says the story of Robinson Crusoe is untrue, because neither religion nor virtue could govern the life of the isolated man. So the people who isolate themselves from full intercourse and fellow feeling with the world restrict their mental and moral growth. Patriotism drags them down. One of our great men, a signer of

the Declaration of Independence, very nobly, but perhaps very unpatriotically, said, a hundred years ago: "The world is my country; to do good my religion." Patriotism is now needless, and it is time to abandon it. None can assert that the man who loves justice, mercy, and truth can be bettered by loving a national flag or wasting love on a form of government. He may well admire and approve the government that successfully preserves peace and sees that justice is done to rich and poor alike; but love should be for truth, beauty, art, and for our fellow men. The nationality of the writer who instructs, the artist who delights, or our brother who suffers, should not be considered for a moment.

Patriotism is a fallacy. It makes men national bigots, without either making them better men or better citizens. It fosters sectionalism, and calls for unreasonable admiration and an unreasoning love for our native or adopted land and all its belongings, without appealing to the judgment. It has long enough masqueraded as a virtue, and may well be put aside with other débris of the past and be superseded by philanthropy. This change in popular feeling may not come immediately, but, looking forward, we can dream of the time when patriotic exhortations will cease, and mankind be governed by the "parliament of man" and nations be joined in the "federation of the world."

JAMES LEEDOM.

DORCHESTER BRANCH
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXX.

NOVEMBER, 1891.

RUSSIAN BARBARITIES AND THEIR APOLOGIST.

BY THE REV. DR. ADLER, CHIEF RABBI OF THE UNITED HEBREW CONGREGATIONS OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

"WOE to thee that spoilest, and thou wast not spoiled; and dealest treacherously, and they dealt not treacherously with thee!" (Isaiah XXXIII., 1.) On this text my revered father and predecessor in office based the discourse which he preached on the day of humiliation that was observed during the Crimean War of 1854. I well remember my father, a man of meek and gentle disposition, expressing the fear lest he might have been carried away by his patriotic fervor to level denunciations of too fierce a character against England's foe. But it would seem as though his words were spoken with prophetic foresight, as though he had instinctively felt that the time would come when the words of Isaiah would be but too fully applicable to the Colossus of the North.

We are told by friendly critics that it is not advisable to employ the language of denunciation when referring to the barbarities practised upon the Jews of Russia. Objections are raised to the publication of *Darkest Russia*, a periodical which is issued by the Russo-Jewish Committee in London with the object of bringing to the knowledge of the civilized world authentic facts relating to the persecution of the Jewish and other nonconformist subjects of that empire. It is argued that the publi-

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

cation of the facts tends to irritate those invested with high authority at St. Petersburg. I fail altogether to grasp either the wisdom or the justice of these criticisms. Is it not in the power of the authorities at once to remove the source of irritation by staying their persecution? Does oppression "that maketh a wise man mad" become legal, just, and equitable when it is practised in the land of the Czars? Does persecution lose its hateful character because it is directed against the downtrodden, defenceless Hebrew? The hapless victims, indeed, are unable to lift up their voice. They must suffer in silence; they are "oppressed and afflicted and they open not their mouth." The Muscovite press is hopelessly and helplessly gagged. Shall their co-religionists who dwell in the happy land of freedom likewise hold their peace, or only speak "with bated breath and whispering humbleness"? Shall they fold their hands in sluggish apathy? "Deliver them that are drawn unto death, and those that are ready to be slain. If thou sayest, Behold, we knew it not; doth not he that pondereth the heart consider it? and he that keepeth thy soul, doth not he know it"? (Proverbs XXIV., 11, 12.) The scriptural monition comes to us with all its native force. And we regard it as our first and obvious duty to place before the world a plain and unvarnished record of the facts, so as to stir and rouse public opinion—public opinion, which, in the memorable words uttered by the Bishop of Ripon at the great Guildhall meeting, "is not the wild hysteria of a few, but the mature judgment of the many; which is the product of the experience of past ages; which is built up in the experience of the bitterness of human outrage; which when it speaks on behalf of mercy is as the voice of God speaking amongst men; which when it speaks on behalf of right is the expression of the opinion of the collective conscience of humanity appealing to the conscience of the one." I readily admit that our publication must be free from exaggeration; that it must rigorously eschew all overdrawn and colored descriptions. We therefore take the utmost pains to gather trustworthy and accurate information; an endeavor which, it need hardly be said, is beset with many difficulties.

But nothing can be more unjust than to stigmatize our narratives as unfounded tales of Muscovite barbarity, or to designate them as idle *canards* proceeding from Jewish sources. Exactly the same deprecatory epithets were levelled at the accounts given

in *The Times* of the persecution of the Jews in 1881 and 1882, until it was demonstrated to the satisfaction of all, with one exception (of which more anon), that they were absolutely authentic matters of fact.

And, being satisfied that our statements are accurate, are we not justified in holding them up to the opprobrium of the civilized world? When Mr. Gladstone, by his famous letter to Lord Aberdeen, made all Europe ring with the story of the sufferings of the prisoners in the dungeons of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, did he then wrap up his statements in sugared words and conventional phraseology? When he felt it his duty to denounce the wrongs that had been committed in Bulgaria, did he permit himself to be muzzled from fear of wounding Turkish susceptibilities? And may we not turn to higher and holier exemplars? When the great seers of old were commissioned to reprove the mighty empires of the East for their oppression and cruelties, did they seek to make their messages palatable by soft flatteries, glossing over all that was vile and contemptible? Did they not portray wrong in all its naked hideousness? Did they not, in words aglow with fiery indignation, teach the immortal lesson that righteousness exalteth a nation, but that ruin and shame will be the inevitable lot of a people that violates the eternal and immutable principles of justice and mercy?

These sacred principles are being flagrantly and violently trodden under foot in the land of the North. It would be beyond the scope of the present article to describe in minute detail the various phases of the persecution to which the Jew of Russia is at present subjected. It may be of advantage to present them in a succinct outline. With the downfall of Ignatieff the outrages which had disgraced the years 1881 and 1882 came to an end. Whether this downfall was brought about, or at least hastened, by the protests raised in the public press, and especially by the memorable meeting at the Mansion House, I will not now stay to inquire. It has been cynically said that the Muscovite does not mind acting brutally, but that he entertains the strongest possible objection to being regarded by others as capable of acting in this fashion. After 1882 we hear no more of bloodshed, pillage, and outrages on women. But other methods were sought to render the lives of the despised Hebrews insupportable. The greatest hardship under which they have suffered from the earliest

period of their settlement was their restriction to fifteen *Gubernia,* besides Poland, as places of residence. These fifteen provinces represent a district of comparatively large area, but lacking in towns of any great commercial importance. Yet the four and a half or five millions who inhabit Russia and Poland managed to earn their subsistence. We hear of them in the towns as the principle traders and artisans,* in the villages as farmers, mill-owners, and dairymen. They were also tacitly permitted to establish themselves in important commercial centres outside the pale of settlement, still greater facilities being given to craftsmen, merchants of the first guild, and those who had received a university education. In the fateful year of 1882, after the excesses had ceased, legislative measures were enacted intended to withdraw all the privileges by which the hardship of the settlement restrictions had, in some measure, been mitigated. The Jews were prohibited from residing outside any of the towns in the pale, and were forbidden to own, farm, or manage landed property. At first these May laws, as they were termed from the month in which they were promulgated, were permitted to remain inoperative. But since the summer of last year they have been enforced by stringent orders from headquarters, with the effect of crowding enormous populations into the congested towns. Artisans are expelled with indignities, as though they were criminals, from cities where they had hitherto gained an honorable subsistence. Men of education are no longer permitted to exercise the professions for which they have been diligently trained. Laws, not inaptly likened to thumbscrews, that had long since fallen into desuetude, are revived and enforced with the utmost rigor, and with a cynical contempt of human rights. Day after day brings us tidings of thousands, who have no fault other than that of being Jews, having been expelled from their homes, and exposed to the most cruel suffering and privation.

What is the result of these measures? The condition of the victims is ineffably sad. Their staff of bread is broken. Instead of enjoying health and vigor, as, owing to their sobriety and temperance, they formerly did, they are now being slowly starved to death. A correspondent testifies: "Among all the population of vast Russia I never met with persons looking more wretched

* There are nearly 300,000 artisans in the fifteen provinces of the pale. Cf. *Données statistiques sur le nombre des Juifs exerçans des métiers,* etc. Saint-Pétersbourg, 1888.

than the emaciated Jews. In all Europe there is no class of men who find it harder to earn a morsel of bread than is the case with nine-tenths of the Russian Jews." No wonder, then, that an exodus has commenced as great and as impetuous as that which took place ten years ago. The poor exiles pour forth over the lines of railway leading from the frontier towns of Russia to the ports of Hamburg and Bremen. A correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, giving an account of the scenes that are daily to be witnessed at the Charlottenburg railway station, commences with the quotation: "If you have tears, prepare to shed them now." And he proceeds to describe the utter wretchedness which the arrival of each train discloses. Haggard men and women are there so weak that they are hardly able to walk, children in scanty raiment, and whole families that had lived in comparative affluence driven at a day's notice from their homesteads and the land which, with all its faults, they still loved.

On hearing the sad tale of all this misery, one is naturally anxious to investigate the causes which have induced this persecution. Those best entitled to form a judgment trace it to religious intolerance and to the insensate thirst for Panslavism which has seized upon so many Russian minds. M. Pobiedonostzeff, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, who unhappily enjoys the full confidence of the Czar, is a fanatic by conviction, and cannot tolerate that the land should be inhabited by those who do not profess the orthodox creed. Hence persecutions of a similar character, though of less intensity, are enacted against Protestants, Catholics, and especially Uniates (Catholics who use the Slav liturgy). Professer Geffcken* writes: "If the latter refuse to have their children baptized by orthodox popes, they are unsparingly deported. Twenty thousand Uniates alone have been removed from the western provinces to Szaratow. Those who remain at home have Cossacks quartered upon them, and all sorts of compulsory means are resorted to in order to stamp out this sect." Trustworthy information has just reached us of the rigorous treatment to which the Stundists are subjected. Persons suspected of belonging to this sect are declared ineligible for any post or employment connected with the village administration. It would almost seem as though a pale of residence were being created for them. But the persecution of the Jew is of a greatly

*"Russia under Alexander III." *New Review*, September, 1891.

aggravated character, and carried on with a more relentless malice, for the following reasons: He is not a Slav, and the watchword has gone forth, "Russia for the Russians." Despite all the obstacles with which he has been hedged, he has thriven. The Jew, whom the Russian hardly ever names without an opprobrious epithet, has outstripped the orthodox Slav in the struggle for life. Hence the present desire to crush and to exterminate the poor Israelite.

But a writer in the August number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW aspires to throw "new light" on this question. Professor Goldwin Smith alleges that the source of the troubles is not religious, but social and economic; that persecution is not the tendency of the Russian or of the church to which he belongs; but that the Jew has brought these calamities upon himself through his parasitic tendencies and his tribal exclusiveness. Verily, these arguments deserve neither to be characterized as light (they resemble rather an *ignis fatuus*) nor can they claim to be regarded as new, seeing that they constitute for the most part the repetition of statements and assertions that were dished up in former articles that appeared in *The Nineteenth Century*. It is not my intention to repeat the arguments with which I traversed my adversary's position touching our alleged tribalism and lack of patriotism, for Mr. Gladstone—no mean arbiter in a controversy—has stated that "when Mr. Goldwin Smith made against the Jews what may be called a charge of incivism, he was met by an effective defence."* Nor need I advert to those arguments which have been answered by Mr. Bendavid in the September number of this REVIEW.†

Before proceeding to answer the specific indictments preferred by this advocate of the Russian Government, I would briefly touch his plea that the Jewish accounts of the atrocities of 1881 and 1882, published in the London *Times*, were in most cases exaggerated and in some to an extravagant degree. Literary encounters with that gentleman on the part of champions immeasurably doughtier than I, notably Mr. Herbert Spencer,‡ have taught me extreme wariness in accepting as final a statement emanating from

* "The Irish Demand," by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1887.

† I do not know what evidence Mr. Bendavid has discovered for the Hebrew descent of Charles Dickens. George Eliot was a profound admirer of the Hebrew genius, but she was not, as far as I have been able to ascertain, of Jewish origin.

‡ "Goldwin Smith as a Critic." *Contemporary Review*, March, 1882.

him. He would palliate the outrages on women committed in 1882 by contending that they could be reduced to half a dozen authenticated cases. I will assume for a moment that this was so. Does this lessen the criminality of the deed? Was not an insult offered by a ruffianly tax-gatherer to one Kentish maiden, the daughter of a tiler of Dartford, sufficient to stir England to rebellion? Mr. Smith commends the reports of the British consuls comprised in two blue-books of 1881 to our earnest study. I join in this recommendation, and would ask the professor to read carefully the second blue-book concerning the treatment of the Jews in Russia (Russia No. 2, 1882). He would find that Sir E. Thornton, H. B. M. ambassador at St. Petersburg, writing to Earl Granville (number 28), encloses an extract from the *Golos* newspaper saying that "in Balta alone cases of violation were numerous. Of these, ten are already known, but the remaining victims are ashamed to come forward." He further writes that an article in the *Golos*, also quoted, admits that the charges brought by foreign newspapers against the administrative abilities of the Russian authorities are but too true, though they may be exaggerated, *but that it is absurd to speak of exaggeration when actual facts are beyond all description.* Could there be a more thorough vindication of the accuracy of the reports of the London *Times?*

But to return to the apology advanced for the anti-Semitic movement in Russia. "The Eastern Church has always been tolerant and free from the stain of persecution." Granted that it was so in former days. Does history not record sudden transformations due to the influence of one masterful mind? And has Russia, indeed, manifested invariably such perfect tolerance? One who has studied the fortunes of Israel in the land of the North will readily remember the horrible sufferings inflicted by Bogdan Chmielnicki, when his hordes of Cossacks swept through Poland intent on pillage and bloodshed, first in 1648, when they murdered many thousands of Jews, and again in 1654, when entire communities in Lithuania were almost completely annihilated, the popes in many cases instigating the massacres.

"The Russian government has never been guilty of persecution. The movement has its main cause in circumstances purely economical, inasmuch as the Hebrews are a parasitic race." On

the very same day that this imputation was published its falsehood was triumphantly proved by men whose information was not derived at second hand, but who had studied the question on the spot. I refer to the articles on "Jewish Colonization" and "The Russian Persecution," by Mr. Arnold White and Mr. E. B. Lanin, which appeared in *The New Review* of August. In graphic language they portray the activity of the Jews as contrasted with the idleness of the general population. If they succeed in trade better than their Christian competitors, it is because the wares they manufacture are of better quality and are sold at a more reasonable price. In addition to the traders there are hundreds of thousands of able bodied men who are engaged in arduous manual toil. There are the artisans of Berditchew, the wharf-laborers of Odessa, the corn-porters of Nicolaieff, the farm-laborers of Kremenchug, in addition to many thousand agriculturalists settled in various colonies who are marked by all the characteristics of a peasantry of the highest order. But I would especially commend M. Leroy-Beaulieu's great work "L'Empire des Tsars et les Russes" to those who desire to study the question thoroughly. He devotes an entire chapter (Volume III, pp. 613—654) to the condition of the Jews, and examines the charge of parasitism brought against them. One striking argument of his deserves citation :—

"Le Juif, affirme-t-on, a en aversion tout travail productif; c'est essentiellement un exploiteur vivant et s'enrichissant du labeur d'autrui. Cela encore peut être vrai, du moins en un sens. Le Juif n'est, le plus souvent, qu'un intermédiaire entre le producteur et le consommateur, et moins il y a de ces intermédiaires, mieux il vaut pour une société. Mais doit-on pour cela poser en principe que tout marchand, tout négociant, tout intermédiaire est un parasite ? Et si cela est vrai du Juif ou du Sémite, comment ne le serait-ce pas également du Chrétien ou de l'Aryen ? Ne sait-on point que la circulation est une fonction essentielle du corps social, comme de tout corps vivant ?" *

But Mr. Smith's most calumnious and mischievous indictment

* "The Jew, they say, holds all productive labor in aversion; he is essentially a trader, living and enriching himself by the labor of another. This is perhaps true, at least in one sense. The Jew is most frequently only an intermediary between the producer and the consumer, and the less there is of the intermediary the better it is for society. But ought one on this account to lay down the principle that every merchant, trader, and middle-man is a parasite? And if that is true of the Jew or of the Semite, why will it not be equally true of the Christian and the Aryan? Does not everybody know that the circulation is an essential function of the body social, as of every living body?"

appears at the close of the article, in the allegation that Nihilism is supposed to be recruited partly from the Jews. It is difficult to use the language of moderation respecting a writer who flings forth an accusation such as this, resting on no more solid a foundation than a mere supposition,—an accusation which might be fraught with the direst consequences to the unhappy people against whom it is recklessly levelled. Such an act is most fitly characterized by the scriptural metaphor of a madman who casteth firebrands, arrows, and death, and says, "Am I not in sport?" Penal codes and social vexations are but too well calculated to sting the Jews of Russia into hatred. But so deeply is the virtue of loyalty ingrained in the Hebrew mind, so ardent is his love of law and order, so profound is his horror of assassination, that the proportion of those who are mixed up with revolutionary plots is extraordinarily small. This is conclusively demonstrated in an article in *Darkest Russia,* entitled, "Are the Russian Jews Dynamite Conspirators?"—where it is shown, by reference to the official lists, that of the thirty persons who were proved to be implicated in the attempts to murder the present Emperor and his august father, there was not one Jew, and only one Jewess, who, however, having linked her fortunes to a person of the orthodox church, could hardly be regarded as a member of the Jewish community.

In dismissing the professor the reflection presses itself upon us. Much might be said in extenuation of the guilt of the Autocrat of all the Russias, shut off, as he is, from the free and wholesome current of public opinion by a dense wall of officialism. Some allowance might even be made for the Procurator of the Holy Synod, who, Torquemada-like, persuades himself that he is working "*in majorem Dei gloriam.*" But no excuse can be offered for one who, privileged to breathe the air of freedom and religious tolerance which wafts through the British Empire, does not hesitate to palliate wrongs, dark and huge as the mountain, and to justify barbarities that cry aloud to heaven for cessation and redress.

But the question forces itself upon every thinking man, "*Quousque tandem?*"—How will this end? An exodus of extraordinary dimensions is progressing. Many thousands emigrate to the United States, that great country whose hospitality is as

unbounded as are its resources, and where they prove themselves diligent, thrifty, and law-abiding citizens. A certain proportion filters into this country, where they have established one branch of industry, the cheap-clothing trade, and largely developed another, the cheap-boot trade. Thanks to the admirable education which their children receive at the Jews' Free School and similar institutions, these foreigners are being slowly but surely assimilated with the population among whom they have chosen to dwell. Large numbers flee to the Holy Land (a veritable Palestine hunger having seized the poor cowed refugees), where several agricultural colonies have been established by the munificence of Baron Edmond de Rothschild and the enterprise of other lovers of Zion. Travellers speak hopefully of the success of these colonies.

It is, however, considered neither wise nor expedient to encourage large settlements of Jews in countries which, like the United States, already number a considerable Hebrew population, or in those which, like our own tight little island, are already over-congested. And here I may mention incidentally that much exaggeration is indulged in concerning the inflow of dense hordes of pauper aliens into London. The publication of the returns issued by the Board of Trade shows very clearly that the increase of the immigration of the Polish Jews into London in the current year, as compared with the last, has been but inconsiderable. But in order to stay all complaints on this head, Baron de Hirsch has propounded a scheme to promote a vast immigration of the Jewish race from Russia to those parts of the world which are as yet sparsely populated. He has devoted two million pounds sterling to the establishment of colonies in various parts of North and South America and certain regions of Africa—colonies for agricultural, commercial, and other purposes. He has enlisted the aid of several men renowned for their great business capacity—men such as Lord Rothschild, Sir Julian Goldsmid, Mr. F. D. Mocatto, Mr. Benjamin Louis Cohen, and M. S. H. Goldschmidt—to aid him in carrying out his colossal scheme. A settlement has already been commenced in the Argentine Republic, and the latest advices I have received speak very encouragingly of the intelligence and industry of the settlers.

And yet, whoever reflects upon the problem will admit that emigration, however large the scale on which it is conducted,

however princely the munificence by which it is subventioned, cannot be viewed as a true solution of the Russo-Jewish question. Emigration can affect but a small proportion of the legion of persecuted Israelites. Even granted that the Czar will let his people go, yet the bulk of the Israelite population must remain behind. They either will not or cannot quit the soil where they have been born and which their fathers inhabited centuries before the Russian appeared there. "Des milliers sont partis ; des millions sont restés," says Leroy-Beaulieu ;—"Thousands have gone; millions remain." The sovereign remedy for all the ills from which the Jews of Russia have suffered so long is to be found in the one word "Freizügigkeit." Liberty to circulate throughout the length and breadth of the land ; freedom to settle in every district of that vast empire, with its eight million square miles and its ample means of subsistence for all its indwellers ; the abrogation of every restrictive law and degrading disability. When, when will the Czar pronounce that redeeming word, so that happier days may dawn for his Hebrew subjects, and a new era of prosperity commence for the whole empire?

HERMANN ADLER.

A PLEA FOR FREE SILVER.

BY THE HON. D. W. VOORHEES, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM INDIANA.

THE precious metals of the world now in use as money may be estimated as follows :

Gold	$3,727,018,869
Silver	$3,820,371,346

The movement, therefore, in this and other countries for the demonetization of silver, and for its degradation to a commodity such as corn, iron, wheat, and pork, has for its plain and specific purpose the destruction of something more than one-half the specie currency of the world. The human mind can hardly conceive a more tremendous financial revolution or one fraught with graver consequences. If it is claimed, however, that the continued and persistent assaults on silver do not mean its complete extermination as a financial factor, but only its curtailment and limitation, the facts of history arise at once to refute such a claim. The position now assumed by the leading opponents of silver money, to the effect that they simply wish to limit its coinage to the American product and to equalize its circulating value with that of gold, is not a position of choice or free will, but is the result of the coercive power of public opinion. It is the position to which in the last fourteen years they have been driven, step by step, by an awakened and aroused resistance on the part of the people to their actual and original scheme for the total overthrow and extinction of silver money.

The fatal scope of the legislation of 1873, by which silver was demonetized, and the sinister and secret methods then adopted, will be remembered as long as the financial history of this country endures ; and the real purpose of the enemies of silver will be understood and interpreted by that legislation, rather than by their present enforced attitude.

The silent and surreptitious elimination of the silver dollar from coinage in 1873, and from circulation as legal-tender except for the sum of five dollars and under, was intended as the death-blow to silver money in this country, and would have remained and operated as such but for the sweeping popular protest which a few years later followed the discovery of the wrong and fraud. The authors of the design against silver at that time played with hidden hands; so much so that the most vigilant representatives in both branches of Congress were deceived, and even the President of the United States, when he signed the bill, was not aware, as his public utterances afterwards disclosed, of the stealthy and destructive step which had been taken.

Now, however, those who eighteen years ago wrought under cover for the destruction of one-half the honest, debt-paying money of the American people, are as well known as if a calcium light had been turned on them, and are as universally distrusted by the plain, laboring, and productive masses as if they had been caught in the commission of crime. This feeling of distrust is confined to no one party. The ablest and most distinguished opponent of silver money in the United States, and, more than any other one man, the author of the legislation of 1873 on that subject, has been before three national conventions of the Republican party seeking a nomination for the Presidency, and seeking it in vain. Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, is always to be spoken of with respect as a man of ability and large experience, and more especially so in connection with the finances of the country. It is true he has been on both sides of every financial issue for more than a quarter of a century past, but it is also true that he has always veered from one point of the compass to the other at the exact time when his services were most valuable to the money power, and most oppressive to the laboring, over-taxed, debt-paying farmers and wage-workers of the country. And yet, with all his eminent services in behalf of the financial centres, as they are called, banking corporations, usurers, interest-eaters, and parasites on human labor generally, the leaders of the Republican party in New York have never dared in national convention to cast the vote of that State for him. The opportunity was presented in 1880, 1884, and 1888, and the weight of obligation which the moneyed interests were under to Mr. Sherman was not denied; but a wholesome fear that the plain people would resent

at the polls his hostility to their interests restrained the impulse of gratitude, if, indeed, such a sensation as gratitude is ever known to organized wealth.

In reaching a conclusion adverse to the sincerity, patriotism, and public virtue of the leaders of the crusade against silver money, the American people have been actively and earnestly engaged, especially since 1878, in educating themselves on the subject from every legitimate source of information. They have examined the history of silver from the days of the patriarchs to the present time, in order to ascertain wherein it has been at fault in the world's commerce, trade, and traffic, and why now, near the close of the nineteenth century, it deserves extermination. They have scanned its career as it has come down through all the ages alongside of gold, in order to see where and when it has proved a less honorable money metal, or a less reliable measure of value, than the yellow coin which has borne it company. When some startling crime takes place, when a homicide is committed, the real motive of the perpetrator becomes the subject of anxious and vigilant scrutiny; and so when the assassination of silver money occurred in 1873, it put the American people on notice to discover, if possible, the true meaning of such an unexpected and revolutionary act. They have found nothing in the origin, history, career, or services of silver during the past four thousand years to inspire an honest or patriotic motive for its death. Its origin as money under divine law is the same as that accorded to gold.

In American history the silver dollar has a peculiarly glorious origin, exalted sanction, and useful career.

The paternity of the silver dollar of the United States is due to Thomas Jefferson. In June, 1783, that great leader of political and economic thought in his own country and throughout the world, was appointed by the Legislature of Virginia a delegate to the Continental Congress, and took his seat as such at Trenton on the 4th day of November following. With the achievement of our independence it became necessary to depart from the English system of pounds, shillings, and pence, and to devise a system of currency for ourselves—an American system. In his autobiography, written in 1821, Jefferson, in referring to the proceedings of the Congress whereof he became a member, says:

"They, as early as Jannary 7, 1782, had turned their attention to the

moneys current in the several States, and had directed the Financier, Robert Morris, to report to them a table of rates at which the foreign coins should be received at the Treasury. That officer, or rather his assistant, Gouverneur Morris, answered them on the 15th in an able and elaborate statement of the denominations of money current in the several States, and of the comparative value of the foreign coins chiefly in circulation with us. He went into the consideration of the necessity of establishing a standard of value with us, and of the adoption of a money unit."

Jefferson then describes the standard of value and the money unit reported by the Financier to whom the subject had been intrusted, and proceeds to point out his objections to the same. Having given his views against the report, he says on page 53 of his autobiography, Vol. I. of his complete works:

"Such a system of money-arithmetic would be entirely unmanageable for the common purposes of society. I proposed, therefore, instead of this, to adopt the Dollar as our unit of account and payment, and that its divisions and sub-divisions should be in the decimal ratio. I wrote some notes on the subject which I submitted to the consideration of the Financier. I received his answer and adherence to his general system, only agreeing to take for his unit one hundred of those he first proposed, so that a Dollar should be $14\frac{88}{100}$ and a crown 16 units. I replied to this, and printed my notes and reply on a flying sheet, which I put into the hands of the members of Congress for consideration, and the committee agreed to report on my principle. This was adopted the ensuing year, and is the system which now prevails."

In the appendix to his autobiography Jefferson still further explains the silver dollar as our standard of value and unit of account and payment, discusses the amount of pure silver and of alloy it should contain, and points out the proportion which gold should bear to silver,—silver being the standard by which to measure the value of gold, as well as the value of everything else.

The action of the Continental Congress, thus secured by Jefferson, was immediately indorsed under the federal constitution of 1789, and received the full sanction of that instrument. Alexander Hamilton, Washington's first Secretary of the Treasury, universally regarded as one of the greatest financiers in the world's history, fully concurred with Jefferson in regard to the coinage and use of silver money. In a report made to Congress in 1791 Hamilton said:

"To annul the use of either of the metals as money is to abridge the quantity of the circulating medium, and is liable to all the objections which arise from a comparison of the benefits of a full with the evils of a scanty circulation."

Washington, in the abundance of his wisdom, gave his strong approval to the free and unlimited coinage of silver, and the giant

intellects of such men as Madison and John Marshall failed to discover that such legislation was either dangerous or reckless. And then from the beginning of the republic, onward in its marvellous career of development and glory, the dollar of the fathers and of the constitution for eighty-four years rendered its constant and indispensable aid to the trade, commerce, and prosperity of the American people. In peace and in war it was honorable par-money, and often higher than par with gold, in all the gigantic and widespread transactions of American progress and expansion. For more than three-quarters of the most enlightened and progressive century in human history the silver dollar was the honored and unquestioned currency of the United States Government. At the most critical and crucial periods of that government's existence it was far more relied upon than gold. The war of 1812, the war with Mexico, and the war for the Union were more indebted for their success to silver money, both as a circulating medium and as a metallic basis for the support of a paper currency, than to gold. The gold of the country in times of peril lies hidden away for speculative purposes, while silver remains with the masses and bears the brunt of active use. It is especially endeared to the pioneers and settlers of the new States, admitted into the Union after the adoption of the constitution, and to their descendants who have witnessed its blessings.

With silver money the vast farming regions of the United States have been bought and paid for, and the homes of millions, and of hundreds of millions yet to come, secured and improved wholly by its use. In all those mighty agricultural belts lying in the embrace of the Mississippi and its tremendous tributaries, it has been known and proudly designated as "land-office money." Up the gradual and fertile slopes of the Rocky Mountains, onward through their deep-cleft cañons, over their ranges of perpetual snow, and down on the other side through lands of fabulous wealth and tropical beauty, to the peaceful waters of the Pacific Ocean, the silver dollar has been the active, ever-present money of advancing civilization, the foremost financial missionary in the conversion of the wilderness and waste places into smiling abodes of human happiness. Silver money is the busy, efficient agent of the laboring millions of the world in their daily and hourly transactions involving small sums, while the functions of gold are

mainly adapted to the use of great operators, the wealthy but powerful few. Hence at every stage of American industrial development, the farmer, the mechanic, the wage-worker, and all the sons and daughters of toil, working their way across the continent, conquering its plains for the husbandman, building cities of commerce by its lakes and rivers, and interlacing it from ocean to ocean with vast thoroughfares of iron, steel, and steam, have never doubted the dollar of their fathers, and have only wished it more plentiful in exchange for their daily labor.

By whom, then, and for what reason, has silver money, with such a record for usefulness and integrity, been assailed for destruction? The charge that it is, or ever has been, dishonest money can come only from dishonest sources. The statement that the legal-tender silver dollar ever cheated the laborer is simply a self-evident falsehood. Those who speak of it as a debased currency only debase themselves by first slandering what their selfish interests and knavish avarice impel them to destroy. Even now, after eighteen years of assault and defamation, crippled and discredited as silver money has been by the legislation of 1873, the world bears witness every day that its purchasing power is as great as that of gold, and that it will purchase the gold itself, dollar for dollar, whenever such a transaction is desirable.

It may be stated, therefore, without the slightest fear of contradiction that the attack upon silver money in this and other countries is based upon no demerit or unsoundness on its part, but is simply a movement for the contraction of the currency to the extent of more than one-half the precious metals now in existence. This movement is made by the moneyed classes who wish to increase the purchasing and interest-gathering power of money in their own hands by making it scarce in the hands of others; by people with large incomes growing out of monopolies protected by unjust legislation; by those who enjoy annuities, interest on public securities, fixed salaries under great corporations, and by the creditor classes in general, including all the enormous loan associations, who join in the movement of silver destruction and financial contraction in order to enchance two-fold, and more, the value and power of the money they wring from the hands of the laboring people. There is a power in this movement of financial contraction, if successful, which will result in the practical enslavement of those who

are in debt and who toil for a living. The power of money to govern countries and to enslave people is always to be found where money is concentrated in the hands of the privileged few, while to the great body of the people, the laboring multitudes, is left but a meagre, scant, and stinted circulation with which to supply their wants and meet the exactions laid upon them. The policy of contraction is the policy of organized, unsparing, pitiless avarice, and in its rage to diminish the amount of money in the hands of the people, one branch of the currency is no more secure from assault than another. The establishment of a plutocracy, which is defined as the "paramount influence of wealth, the rule or supremacy of the rich," is the sole aim and end in view, and neither is the best-secured, best debt-paying, legal-tender, par-circulating paper money in the world, nor gold itself, if found to stand in the way of contraction, any safer than silver from attack by the enemies of a full circulation and good prices for labor and property.

Gladstone, in pointing out the dangers which beset England, says: "We are in danger of engendering both a gerontocracy and a plutocracy." A gerontocracy signifies the rule of old families—a danger not yet imminent in this country; but a far greater evil is at our doors. The power of money, pure and simple, in the hands of a very small percentage of our population, who are without ability except in money-getting, and without honorable service to their country in war or in peace, now rules the councils of this government, and casts its threatening and baleful shadow over the present and the future of the American people.

In arriving at a conclusion as to the true motives which inspire the movement for the demonetization of silver, the history of the production of the precious metals and the effect of new mines and increased supplies become of great interest and importance. When gold was found in large quantities in California and Australia, a panic ensued among the creditor and fixed-income classes throughout the world, for fear the amount of gold then in use would be so increased as to weaken its purchasing power, and make it too easily attainable by the producing classes in exchange for their commodities.

He who examines the current history of the times forty years ago will find that upon the discovery of the new gold-fields of that period an excited and alarmed discussion sprang up in regard to

the threatened evils of a gold-inflation produced by an over-abundant supply of that particular metal. Many writers throughout Europe and in this country engaged their talents on the subject. They regarded the expansion of the currency by the new streams of gold pouring into it as a frightful calamity, and raised their vehement and doleful protests against it.

Many authors might be cited, and numerous extracts given, all evincing the same hostility to gold because of the quantity, not the quality, of the money it was likely to afford. So great, in fact, was the alarm created that gold was actually demonetized in Austria and in most of the German states within a period of seven or eight years after California and Australia commenced pouring their treasures into the channels of trade and commerce. This action was reversed, and silver was selected as the victim for demonetization, only when the discovery of silver in such mighty deposits as the Comstock Lode and in other great mines seemed to threaten a greater increase in silver than in gold.

In a speech of very great ability and research delivered in the Senate on the 12th and 13th days of May, 1890, Senator Jones, of Nevada, made the following statement :

"But as soon as the discoveries of gold were made in the alluvial deposits of California and Australia, or, rather, as soon as it was suspected that money would thereby become considerably increased in volume, the annuitants and income classes, the creditors everywhere, took steps to avert what they characterized as a great calamity. They openly declared their purpose, by every means in their power, to prevent a decline in the value of money, so that the purchasing power of their incomes might not be reduced. They determined to go to any length in order to prevent the rise of prices which their aggressive instincts led them to fear would follow the addition to the money volume of the world by the natural and much-needed yield of the mines. The fiat therefore went forth that one of the metals must be discarded. If anything were needed to demonstrate that the reason for the demonetization of silver was the cupidity of the creditor classes, the money-lenders, annuitants, and those in receipt of fixed incomes, and that it was not any defect inhering in the metal silver, nor any change in its adaptability to subserve the purposes of money, it is found in the significant fact that the metal first selected for demonetization was not silver, but gold—that metal which has since become the idol of the money-changers, and which is now declared to be the only natural money. The openly-avowed determination was to increase the power of money, and in order to accomplish that purpose the metal which promised the largest yield was to be condemned and stripped of its ancient monetary function. So strongly was this determination set forth, so earnestly was it presented, and so urgently pressed on the ground of duty, that its achievement came to be regarded as the fulfilment of a high moral purpose."

It is constantly insisted, however, that the coinage and use of silver money will drive gold out of the country which adopts both metals. The facts of history not only refute such a statement, but place it beyond discussion and reduce it to contempt. The dismal prediction of gold-exportation from our shores was repeated a thousand times on the floors of both branches of Congress when silver was restored to coinage in 1878, and the raven-croak of coming disaster was taken up and echoed all over the land by the subsidized agencies of the monometallists, the money power, the plutocracy. It is enough to say on this point that, while there were $230,000,000 of gold in this country in 1878, there are about $700,000,000 now. Instead of being forced abroad by the exigencies of trade, gold has remained at home and multiplied itself more than three-fold. This stupendous fact would of itself crush the movement for the destruction of silver were it not that insatiate avarice is deaf to reason and blind to truth. The spirit of Mammon, the lowest of the fallen angels, can never die, but lives on forever, spanning the eternities with falsehood, fraud, and false pretence, for the oppression of the toiling multitudes of the human race.

Let France be cited in proof of the fraternal relations with which gold and silver, when equally honored, move along *pari passu* in the affairs of a government, whether in prosperity or adversity, in sunshine or in storm. The government of France since 1803, whether under the Napoleons or the Bourbons, or emerging from the rags and shackles of monarchy into the glorious garb of a republic, has never discriminated between the free and unlimited coinage of the two metals, and her financial record, tried by the hardest tests, is without a parallel amongst the nations of the earth. No other people on the globe could have furnished forth without panic, bank failures, and widespread financial disaster, one thousand millions of dollars ($1,000,000,000) in gold on the sudden demand of their conquerors, to be drawn at once in bulk by loaded trains and army wagons from their country. Through this terrible ordeal the government of France, without sigh or groan of financial distress, passed at the close of the Franco-Prussian War. Her people, full of employment at fair prices, with a circulating medium three times as large per capita as their European neighbors, or as our own, have remained contentedly at home. Emigration from France is unknown,

while every port on our shores is crowded from day to day and from year to year by German laborers, the very bone and sinew of their fatherland, fleeing from the oppression and impoverishment inflicted upon Germany by the demonetization of silver and the meagre amount of money left in circulation. In a recent speech made by Joseph F. Johnston, president of the Alabama National Bank at Birmingham, the following very striking and instructive passage occurs :

"Can we not follow in the steps of the great republic of Europe? No country on the face of the earth has such a financial record as France ; in an incredibly short period of time she not only recovered from the enormous losses of war, and the heavy exactions of a victorious enemy, but was able to come to the relief of imperial England and save her from destruction, when her financial system was tottering, and the monetary repose of the world threatened by the fall of the Barings.

"If, at that time, she had had only one hundred millions of silver, instead of seven hundred millions, what destruction would have followed that financial earthquake! The broken wrecks would have been found on every beach, and desolation and distress would have swept over the civilized world. . . .

"If all the silver produced in the world, less that used in the arts, was coined into dollars by the government of the United States, it would require the world's product for nearly ten years to give us the per-capita circulation of silver that France now has."

But the opponents of silver in the United States point to Great Britain as an example for the American people to follow. A more unfortunate reference could not be made in support of the demonetization of silver. The British Government is based upon an aristocracy of wealth and pauperized labor to an extent hitherto unknown since the downfall of corrupt, imperial Rome. Her policy has not only placed her as the leading creditor nation of the earth, but in the midst of her own people she has made distinctions so deep and broad that the very few own everything, and their established incomes swallow up the proceeds of every toiling hand in the United Kingdom. The oppression of the British laborer arises not from free trade, which is, in fact, the chief wisdom of that government, and of all other governments in a condition to adopt it, but from a stringent contraction of the amount of money in circulation, and the consequent increase of the purchasing power of money in exchange for labor and for what labor produces.

A glance at the creditor and income classes, on the one hand, and the toiling multitudes, on the other, throughout Great Britain,

is appalling. According to reliable official statements, the population of the United Kingdom, embracing England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, may be put down at 28,000,000, and her lands at 72,119,962 acres. Of these lands 51,885,148 acres, more than two-thirds of the whole landed property of the kingdom, are owned by less than 11,000 persons. These vast land-owners draw a rental from an oppressed tenantry of over $562,000,000 per annum, and as the amount of money circulating in the kingdom is contracted, and its volume diminished, so is the purchasing and governing power of these enormous millions increased, and the privileged few aggrandized by grinding the faces of the poor. The foreign policy of England is often denounced for its brutal rapacity, but her home policy, whereby an idle, sensual, income-devouring aristocracy enjoys full and free license to prey upon her toiling masses, wears a darker hue than even the perfidious and crimson stains she has left on distant shores, and with which she has incarnadined the seas. The demonetization of silver is simply in accord with her general system of wealth-aggrandizement and labor-oppression, and is driving her laboring subjects from her shores in numbers equal to great armies every year.

Let those who ape the British system of finances look steadfastly at the horrible results which have followed its adoption and enforcement at home. It is there, as it is here, a concoction of educated, sleepless, ruthless avarice for the purpose of making a shrinkage in all values except the value of money due to the monopolists of wealth; for the purpose of cheapening the wages of every day-laborer and the price of everything which labor has to sell. Such a system of government is fraught with far greater calamities to the great body of the people than the visitations of war or the scourge of pestilence. Falling prices, low rates for labor, and business stagnation, consequent upon scarcity of money among the people, constitute the sources of all the evils which ever afflicted civilized man.

Political organizations may be disturbed by differences of opinion in their ranks, and may sometimes dodge and evade this great question as far as possible; but the American people are growing more enlightened every day, and in the very near future they will reëstablish the policy of Jefferson and the fathers, and restore to themselves the natural and unrestricted use of silver money. The free and unlimited coinage of silver will stand as

an issue in the elections of this and approaching years until its complete triumph. No one, at least in the Democratic party, will seek to obscure or subordinate other great issues, such as Tariff Reform, the Force Bill, and the prevailing profligacy in the expenditure of public moneys, but, at the same time, no one need expect the silver issue itself to be ignored, or to lose its vital importance in the consideration of the people or in the councils of the government.

D. W. VOORHEES.

ARE FRENCH NOVELS FAITHFUL TO LIFE?

BY MADAME ADAM.

THE question I am requested to answer is: "Does the French novel picture faithfully the life and customs of France?"

I reply without paraphrasing, "No, the French novel does not picture the life and customs of France"; and I hope to prove it to the readers of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in these few pages.

The first obstacle that prevents our novels from presenting the life and customs of our country in their entirety—and if there are exceptions, they only prove the rule—is that they are all written in Paris, edited in Paris, read in Paris, criticised and classed according to their value at Paris, and that they can attain success only in Paris itself. Literature copies its centralizing tendencies from the system of centralization in politics. But it oversteps and exaggerates the latter; for the political representative elected from any one of the four corners of France comes to the capital with ideas and character already formed and definitely moulded by his local surroundings. He is always in touch with his constituents; he returns to them several times a year; has interests in the province; a family there; keeps his local feeling, and generally has a higher position there than the one he occupies at the Palais Bourbon. Doubtless after their arrival in Paris and several years' sojourn there, these deputies and senators alike, whose work and whose mission are in attending to the rural and provincial politics, do come under the influence of the centralizing tendency of Paris to some extent; but they do not allow it to possess them and dominate over them as the young *littérateurs* do. If our novels were written at Marseilles, at Lyons, at Rouen, or at Lille, our novelists would be much better armed against injurious contagion; they would the more easily defend themselves

from what doctors call morbid affections, and they would escape the dangers that come from the concentration of intellectual vitality that soon overheats itself—a concentration that is filled with injurious principles. The crowding of different organisms, whatever they may be, cerebral or otherwise, which hinders the free play of development, is contrary to the laws which regulate life in general and to the law of circulation which prescribes certain rules under pain of great disturbance.

When any one discusses the question of the decentralization of the arts in France, they tell him that for the most part our novelists are born in the provinces, and that consequently, having been brought up there, they ought to know the country and how to describe it. But that requires examination. Take one of our young novelists who has talent and possesses the qualities of a great man. It will be granted me that I have known, entertained, and counselled several of them. He is born in some province, if you will, but his childhood is passed under the walls of some college, or in a family that is well educated, where he sees only his parents and an occasional friend and comrade. If he has been a laborer all through his youth or has been absorbed in his studies, where would he find leisure for observation? Some things have from time to time struck him because of peculiarities in them, particularly from a ridiculous side. Having at last graduated, the ambition presses upon him to leave his village or small town; for he seems to store up only grievances against the life of mediocrity about him and wishes to fly from what "stifles his faculties," according to the time-honored phrase—narrow, vulgar mediocrity, he repeats, and sees but one side of it. Only half-conscious of the deception of his feelings, for his longing is blind and passionate, he encourages himself to take the step that is to make him an exile, that will transplant him from his native soil; but he considers it a deliverance and a liberation. This corner of the world where he first saw day, so dear to so many Frenchmen, has become a horror to him, and gradually he has grown to look upon what should naturally be his friend as an enemy.

No, he can no longer live in the country; better die of hunger or of other miseries. He must go away where tradition says that thought is untramelled and the horizon broad; in fact, he must go to the great, the only Paris.

I am speaking of a talented novelist; not of one of those unfortunate beings who believe they are writers of ability when they are really not so, and who go, poor moths! only to be burned in the blaze of Paris. The young and talented novelist brings a form and a style with him to Paris that he has acquired in this much-scorned country, and these are and will be the groundwork of his future fame. From the time of his arrival in Paris he looks out for a new subject. That is the great watchword, the one important thing—something new; that is, a situation for a romance, a subject that has not yet been treated, or not recently, by a well-known novelist. Even if, for want of something better, he consents to take his heroes from the midst of the province he has so ungraciously abandoned, he will describe the spot where he ignores or denies the existence of any virtues or nobleness, any devotion or, however much concealed, any possibility of happiness, security, perseverance, or any silent grandeur; where everything in the life of the place radiates inward, where the people lead pure lives among themselves, and where so few things draw them to the outer world. But to give a true picture of humanity there and of the scenes of provincial life he must have first loved it himself, must have felt the passions, the cares, the illusions, the surprises, and the joys of it all. Then he would be understood and would understand the others, whereas in reality he is more of a stranger there than a tourist who stops to take a look at the place as he passes through.

If a Parisian author comes back to the country in the vicinity of his native place, it is not to lend an ear to the sweet eloquence of comparisons between this spot and the great city, but to listen as he passes along to the ill feeling among the people, to the recital of some who retail scandal to the Parisian traveller, never failing to add, "It is a true story." And this distortion of a story bears the same relation to them that an actual novel does to the world. Both seek unusual facts, not the general life or an analysis of the existence of the majority of the peasants, workmen, citizens, and people of the middle classes.

The place is so completely composed of one party, the sentiments are so unanimous, that our novelist thinks only of representing the Parisian world composed of more than 50,000 persons separated into nobility, upper-middle class, scientists, artists, politicians, and all those who belong to any of the classes that

have become so dear to the writers of our time. And then at certain epochs men of letters, as well as statesmen, have been astonished by some great change of opinion which in a day jumps from one class of literature to another so completely that one group of writers finds itself speaking falsehoods. It is the country which has refused to let itself be led away by a fashion it has wearied of, or which has become irritated at being abused by hollow words.

French writers for the most part depict nature marvellously well, because it is only necessary to examine nature carefully with an artist's eye to fix the picture and its objects in the mind. Immovable in itself, it finds variety in art. Then, too, no one of our writers describes or judges a landscape in the same way, and all men of imagination—that is, descriptive writers—might pass by the same spot at the same moment and they would paint it in different tints and conceptions, in different styles, and from different points of mental view. French writers have this faculty to a remarkable degree. Never have they understood their work better. Never have they applied the experience and the methods of their old masters to better purpose; but their pictures of life in France and of the customs of the country are so often false, incomplete, untrue, that a stranger cannot, by eliminating, form, as we can, a true estimate of the state of our morality, our family tastes, our motives to action, our sentiments, beliefs, hatred of evil, and efforts toward good.

The novelist I speak of knows no more than Paris,—the true Paris,—since he does not even know his native province. He only remains there until he has created a sort of relationship with the people, wholly external, however—external appearances put on for the benefit of the stranger who is amusing himself there. He sees vice which is displayed because it is merchandise and which passes and repasses before him until it has harpooned its victim. Then he takes this vice for his subject. He writes books with the magic of a style which makes his reputation and purifies it by the absolution of art. Later on, perceiving the insufficiency of his material, and better initiated into the life of what is called the *bout Paris*, he sees what comes to the surface at the capital. When he becomes part of this, he believes that his field for observation is secured for all time in its greater breadth; whereas, in reality, this field does not surpass, either for physical or psychological

observation, the ones he might have studied just as well at Rheims, at Angers, or at Toulouse.

The complexity—and the love for it—of exceptional phenomena and of anomalies, which reigns master in Parisian society, to which must be added the fear of falling into weariness, and finally the passion for turning everything to amusement, soon takes possession of a writer who has no compass to guide him and no principles founded on classic examples to prevent him from going astray. He becomes incapable of searching out and discovering the simple truth. He is forever liable to unhealthy influences—to the influence of the exceptional in life. His readers, created by himself, follow him and exact from him something they have not read already, and their favorite has no choice but to find it in the untruthful and the inadmissible.

Able writers in France are making more and more use of form, as time goes on, the lower they fall towards mediocrity of subject-matter. They are becoming more artistic, as singers do whose vocal organs are beginning to decay, but they wander hopelessly away from the true conception of the common things of common life. A novelist describes transitory customs, various individuals of mixed origin, unbalanced natures, people of no class, strangers, men who have suddenly become rich, upstarts, and vainglorious and showy characters. But he gives no idea whatsoever of the life and manners of the two million Parisians about him. If, like M. Zola, he stoops to write of the very bottom of the city, he will go too low, and, like him, will produce something abnormal. The Parisian laborer could not be recognized in these sketches. I have many times talked with the workmen of Paris, and they are scandalized at him ; they detest him, and only become indignant when they read him.

The idealist of the " fourth estate " at the capital finds his literary expression in Victor Hugo or Lamartine, or even in the fantastic pictures of the authors of newspaper stories. Realism and naturalism only keep themselves alive by artificial and restrained observations ; their general truth cannot be imposed upon the people of Paris. The people disdain them ; they are tired of them ; and yet they will give a hundred *pot-bouille* or a hundred *assommoirs* at the theatre for the " Lyons Mail," to witness persecuted innocence—passion rather than open debauchery. My readers will pardon me, I am sure,—and I pray

them to understand that I have drawn a young novelist at his early work,—that I have made general criticism on a general type rather than on an individual. Had I drawn a single personality, I should have gone contrary to my own method, which is to search for general information instead of isolated facts.

In the early literatures the writer takes for his groundwork his own countrymen. He is necessarily an historian, but he avoids being a chronicler of state documents. He represents an entire race by its primitive qualities, which in turn give its character precisely. Not having any fear that he is going to repeat something already written, with his mind untroubled by situations that have been used before, or by any mine already exploded, he sees the general lines of character, the distinct characteristics of the whole race. These figures have a grand and simple majesty, bound together as they are by the very soul of the people and the race. In fact, all the heroes of these early literatures have in time become traditional types that are forever real.

To-day the closeness of the relations of one with another, the facility of communication for all people, and the constant exchange of literary productions, make the types quite different from those of an earlier date. One scarcely finds the types of the last quarter of a century to-day at all; and yet ought they not to be observed carefully among all this mass, so that their good and bad qualities may be preserved? Character, physiognomy, manners, had changed in France from century to century before the Revolution, and it is just as easy to recognize Frenchmen of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries by their characteristics as it is to recognize an Englishman, an American, or a German. The different occupations, intellectual and physical, put their stamp on men of the same race living at the same time.

Homer in his immortal works has painted for all time the virtuous, patient, faithful wife in Penelope; craft and tenacity of purpose in Ulysses; purely physical courage in Achilles; infidelity and inconstancy in Helen; and the husband deceived but indulgent because of his love in Menelaus. All these figures are true because of the reality and the art in them. Phidias has shown us his method of creating typical beauty by taking from one person a line of the face, and from others a leg, an arm, or the stature. The time was not consumed by him in embarrassing himself with details, nor in giving his work too great a heaviness.

He dedicated himself to that which includes in the smallest space the greatest amount of observation.

The later and riper literatures voluntarily abandon the search after general types, because writers imagine that the demand for novelty which their readers have cannot be satisfied with the renewal of characters. They deceive themselves; for this same repetition does satisfy a part of the public curiosity to-day. The types exist always, just as vegetation and growth exist when the material and seed are at hand.

The grand currents of human intelligence run by their constant oscillations from the form to the idea, from the exaltation of the flesh to the most complete spiritualization, and they permit at any time the complete summarizing of the good and bad qualities of a certain number of men and women. A writer will be more certain to interest powerfully those who read him, and that too for all time, if he gives general truths rather than specializations, which go out of fashion like certain clothes. He is certainly more likely to be read a second time.

What made the literary and artistic power of the Greeks—a power that will forever be the highest—is that for the first and only time in human history the Greeks knew how to combine for an instant form and ideal in art by deifying matter and materializing the divine.

In our time Balzac has gone to the extreme of specialization, searching out the individual events even up to the gate of the tribunals, adding to this specializing quality all that his imagination suggested to him, and finally producing characters that have survived because they have a certain amount of reality in them; but at times they contain so little truth that the passionate admirers of the great writer have come to imitate and copy the heroes of Balzac in order to give them a little life. And thus he made his contribution in this manner to the records of the most insincere generation it has been permitted us to examine. Flaubert is, among the other famous writers of modern France, the one who has chosen his types most sincerely by honest observation and by examining ancient and modern peoples; and he has materialized his thoughts most thoroughly in the ideal parts of his characters. Those who write or have written of his time may perhaps be his equals, but no one can surpass him except Victor Hugo, who is more colossal. Bouvard and Pecuchet

will always be a pair of historic characters in the history of our times.

When some one calls to the attention of hardened naturalists the fact that an absolutely unique character can exist, just as monstrosities and material phenomena certainly do, but says that, however true that may be, it is not true in the highest sense of the word, since an absolutely unique character does not necessarily reproduce itself in the same form again, they answer: What exists for this one hour, having, as it does, its place in the general life, can be as justly described and written upon as something that normally reproduces itself. Doubtless; but we have the right to add: In nature the tree torn by a tempest, filth thrown from a house into the street, are an injury to mankind; things that are ugly, distasteful, of bad odor, criminals—all these are the exceptions which nature, society, and mankind drive out, and from which they cleanse themselves. Why should we try to give these by the use of art that which everything unites in denying to them?

The hard-and-fast rules of the naturalists pretend to cover themselves with the comprehensive name of science, and then they proceed to go contrary to its mandates. They never control one fact by another similar to it. They are satisfied to force some fact which they have observed into the same class with others which absolutely contradict it, because of a single demonstration, no matter how irregular it may be. They take possession of some moral or material irregularity, but they add nothing to their supply of scientific observations, and they claim it for themselves not so much from the particular observation as on the ground of truth! The characters of the individuals whom they choose as their heroes must always be followed by an epithet. It is the drunken laborer, the lost woman, the nervous man of the world, etc., etc. A naturalist once said to me: "The ugly thing in them brings their characters out just as hideousness does that of the monster, but beauty in all its forms is always insipid."

Those naturalists of the school of M. Zola make their characters move in the midst of scenes which they describe with an amount of detail that conceals the absence of truth still more. The superficial reader says to himself: "Oh, can this be so? I almost believe I can breathe the bad air of the stairway which he describes; there are, indeed, such objects in a bedchamber, in a kitchen, in a linen-room; there are just such thistles in the field

or near the rocks, and such uncleanliness in a corner of the farm. Labor and the sun make men sweat; and why should not the characters described here be as real as everything else?"

The idealists put their characters in an atmosphere of idealized nature, on a background slightly blurred and in an irregular frame, so as to give more relief to the figures they paint. Exaggerating them continually, they give them too much character. They believe in the sacredness of art. They can describe what is odious, criminal, and tragic; never the indelicate. Low passions, disgusting details, as a rule, never attract people. When they meet something of the sort in their path, they turn aside and try to avoid it. Why put it in a book under the noses of readers? Where there are exceptions by the way, disgusting features of life, there is not the proper way, nor the proper life.

Few among the generality of mankind look for the repulsive or wallow in vice. Wickedness and ugliness, if they were produced in equal quantities with beauty and virtue, would long ago have overrun humanity and society. Dr. Sombroso, in his learned studies, shows us the cause of crime and of animal tastes, but by this he proves that it is not the law of our being. Nature, like man, and in general like society, fights against corruption, which she covers with the veil of vegetation, as art should cover with its veil the monstrosities of society. Indeed, it has been established that these monstrosities would occur less frequently if they were not—so to speak—given as an example to those who have an instinct towards evil. How can a novelist who is of the naturalistic school, who is the painter of existing customs as the historian is of past events and the learned scholar of eternal events—how can he choose only that which nature teaches him is transient, especially when she tries to bury it or transform the filth?

The idealists, too, are not always free from the reproach of searching for exceptions in their characters, and they often injure their demonstration by giving the naturalist the opportunity of saying: "That is not true." I repeat, the type is rarely sought, since it is more difficult to find than the individual. A picture from nature is necessarily easy to paint, since the composition employed in making a bit of nature complete is of a very high order—requires genius, in fact, and that is supplied by nature herself.

Naturalism—that is to say, the brutal use of ugliness in all its forms, the excessive centralization of literature which collects all French writers in Paris within a narrow field of observation—has created a profane class of talented authors,—one cannot speak of a *sacred* class in designating naturalism,—who have made themselves echoes of each other and have infested journalism with their coterie. Not having anything to oppose them except powers like those of Victor Hugo and Flaubert, they have drowned, so far as the general public is concerned, the voice of writers of another sort of ability who still remain faithful to their pen and their art. Some of our old masters still living have sacrificed to the golden calf and called the schism just, but a great current is gradually, little by little, setting aside the literature of the mire, of vice, of drunkenness, of debauchery, and of all that is ignoble. Things that are neither vile nor tainted are beginning to please; better still, by an implacable logic idealism made repulsive in man by the naturalists is being sought now in nature by the symbolists to a great extent. Before long young writers will turn towards those qualities and passions that really exist among their French brothers, laborers, middle class, nobles, artists; and, instead of exciting the different classes to hold each other in contempt, they will cause them to take the trouble to know and esteem each other so that they may help one another socially, if need be, and that abroad one may judge us at last as we are.

"Misfortune to the vanquished" is a terribly true motto. The conquered often add defeat to defeat; and that is what we have done by a certain phase of literature, the most brilliant of our arts since 1870. To-day fortified, thinking of a gradual but necessary decentralization, having regained a consciousness of our material and intellectual resources, we are forcing our novelists to raise us in art as we have raised ourselves in national and international politics. Literature has not escaped the great popular inspiration. After having been put in a degraded position by fashion, it will glorify honor and heroism, and it will represent far more truly after this, if not our character, at least our truest private and public aspirations.

JULIETTE ADAM.

THE LACK OF GOOD SERVANTS

BY MRS. M. E. W. SHERWOOD.

THIS is getting to be a very important and curious question—one of the few that does not right itself. In more than one prosperous village of New England, through central New York and Pennsylvania,—probably the geographical limits could be stretched further,—families are disbanding, going to hotels for their dinners, living in anybody's house but their own, in lack of a servant or servants. These well-to-do people are willing to pay good wages and give their servants every comfort, but a maid who can cook and wash and iron is becoming a greater luxury than a powdered footman in London. A person who can and will work with her hands has become the lawgiver to those who cannot. Where is that class whom, with a fine irony, we call "Help"?

It is a perilous state of things, and not to be endured, when a well-to-do lady, in a prosperous town, has to stay at home from church all through the summer because she cannot find a nurse to care for the baby, and because no maid can be hired for love or money. These people are perfectly willing to pay good wages, to lodge and feed their servants well; but although the cities are full of starving, able-bodied people, the deadlock continues. It is a mysterious and inexplicable problem, more to be wondered at than the occasional and inevitable panic, worse than the strikes, because it lasts all the year round, and impossible, from the point of view of the starving, who would, one would think, rather become domestic servants than starve.

The Swedes make the best servants of all our imported working people, and the reason of it was gravely stated to me by a Swedish cook (who had herself risen to be the mistress of servants, and who deeply deplored the idleness and the disobe-

dience which, she said, were creeping in even amongst them in our American life) to be the old Swedish custom of "Husalga,"—an old Swedish law by which the masters are still empowered to inflict corporal punishment on their servants, male and female. "Ah!" said Freuda, "that made good servants!" So would have argued the housekeepers of the South; and, no doubt, in a kindly and well-ordered Southern family fifty years ago there were the best of all servants. Authority, not brutality, authority enforced by law, is necessary to the proper conduct of a kitchen, as of a state. Employers should be bound to the rules of justice and humanity, and should have neither right nor power to require from their servants what is unjust or inhuman; also the duties of servants should be clearly defined, reasonable, and fixed. The mistress should have her rights as well as the servant. Once hired and taken into the house, the mistress is legally entitled to the servant's time and service, and the servant should stay out the number of weeks or months for which she has contracted. But in the United States a maid may go at any moment; she follows her caprice; may leave the dinner half cooked and the baby crying in the cradle. The mistress must pay her and let her go.

Of course this terrible condition of inequality cannot exist forever. The American mind is fertile of expedients, and will in time educate both mistresses and maids in their respective duties. It is quite impossible that the affairs of a household can be administered with prosperity and comfort if the mistress does not know what ought to be done and if the servant does not know how to do it. It has been the confusion of the American experiment—this taking of the Irish peasant, the peasant from the fields of Europe, into the small, well-regulated, private family; to expect a creature with no training at all to cook, wash, and iron, sweep, dust, and to take care of children—that most delicate of all industries—acceptably. Her own home has certainly not been a superior establishment for the formation and development of high industrial and domestic qualities. A woman goes out to service as into a new existence. Dress and language are unfamiliar. Her very shoes and stockings are, to her, new and inconvenient appendages. The furniture, food, employment, are as different to her as is the cabin of the Irishman from the palace of the peer. An American kitchen, with its neat cooking-stove and its mechanical

aids to facilitate labor (so easy a book to read for the well-educated wife of an American mechanic), is to the foreign servant a thing as different from her first impressions, associations, and habits as the speaking of Chinese would be to her mistress, were she to be suddenly invited to a tea party in Hong Kong. No doubt both mistress and maid are mutually disgusted and displeased, and the maid takes leave: the mistress is very grateful if she takes nothing else.

There are women born into this world with a capacity for training servants. To them we owe that large class of really good and efficient women who can be found in large cities, Irish women generally, who have been in the country several years, but who are very much in the minority. Now, the existence of such women suggests the first step toward the remedy. Why should not such women open schools for the domestic and industrial training of servants? I have heard of a few such institutions in different parts of the country; that is a favorable omen, but it does not extend far enough. Why will not ladies take it up, as they have done the training-school for nurses, that industry which has had so tremendous a result in making Mrs. Gamps impossible, and giving to poor humanity that which it so gravely needed—an educated intelligence in the sick-room? These establishments for the training of servants are far too few to be felt and appreciated in their advantages throughout the country at large; but imagine what a splendid opening there is for some hundreds of intelligent women who are now, perhaps, eating their hearts out in some lonely New England homes, wondering what they shall do with their lives, if they would organize a training-school for servants, take the ignorant peasant girl just arrived at the government docks, teach her how to cook, or to sew, or to wash and get up fine linen; make of her a thoroughly good servant, teaching her first a subject on which she is always very ignorant,—moral obligation,—an ignorance fostered by the general condition of the social state. Indeed, the general condition of the social state is answerable for the majority of the evils connected with domestic service. Let them teach her that she should treat the property of her employers as carefully as if it were her own; that, as her employers are obliged to do justly by her, so should she be just to her employers; that she should respect their rights, and defend

them, as she hopes that they will respect hers ; and inform her that it is a principle lying at the very basis of civilized life that substantial and valuable service will be well paid for always by those for whom the service is rendered. The law of wages is no mere custom or tradition, but the obligation of natural justice and the rights of man. The debt and obligation are not on one side, however,—on neither side exclusively,—but should conjointly rest on both.

The Americans are the only people in the world who pay well for bad cooking and detestable service, grudgingly given, glad in most instances (if rural housekeepers) to "get a girl," no matter how inefficient and disqualified she may be, for the work of the house. She must be fed, clothed, and respected, and her wages paid. She may break crockery to any extent, often to that of thousands of dollars ; she may throw away sugar and flour and meat and potatoes by bad cookery ; she may be insolent to her mistress, taking her own time for going out day or evening ; and she may badly wash the flannels and scorch the gentleman's shirts : the mistress must put up with it, else the precious creature will leave and the lady must do her own work ; or, as a dress-maker who had badly cut some gowns for an employer remarked, putting the fragments in at the door : "Here, finish your gowns yourself."

This is not good political economy. The servant should be taught moral obligation. We must remember that there is no tyranny in a republic ; there can be none but the tyranny of the masses. And as the welfare of the millions is bound up in this question, as the comfort and prosperity of our great estate must depend on the industrial ability and honesty of those who serve us for wages, it follows that the first thing to teach a servant is a sense of moral obligation. When we take into consideration the early history of those who come to us as domestic servants, the marvel turns out to be, not that they are so deficient, but that they are not more so. Look at the poorer classes in the streets of Glasgow, for instance ; we need not cross to the adjacent king-dom ; we know all about "the pig and the praties," and really from Pig-and-Pratie-dom came some of the very best of our nurses and maids. No one who has kept house a number of years but has a sprinkling of delicious and refreshing gratitude, in her reminiscences, over some dear and faithful Biddy. Their

faults are those of ignorance and that double brain which is always tripping itself up (the cause of the Irish bull), the impossibility of a clear comprehension of the straight road, blinking, and being blinded by their own wit, and their aimless, inaccurate absence of logic. How much could be done by giving these Norahs the healthy and bracing influence of honest Puritan training in a New England town! We all know what it has done for some of them,—made them perfect servants.

"Yes," the unhappy Massachusetts matron will say, "it has made them too good to work. They will not come, for twelve dollars a month, to cook, wash, and iron, as they used to do; no, and the second girl generally marries her master, if he becomes a widower." Quite so; we have to meet the enervating influence of prosperity and luxury even here. But we should not be dismayed. We must go still further in our educational efforts for servants. The raw material is being dumped at the government docks at the rate of five or six thousand a week, to state it mildly. The great German steamers, those from Rotterdam, those from Havre and from Liverpool, all deposit great quantities of young women, who have come on to make a living, every day in the week. Why should there not be an organized body of respectable women to meet them, to take them into cleanly homes, to train them to become good domestic servants? They would be worth half a dozen Lady Clara Vere de Veres, each one of them—worth forty over-educated, brain-feverish students of the higher education, who can do nothing, either as housekeepers or breadwinners. No sadder story is extant than the story of the fate of those highly-educated daughters of washerwomen who have been over-educated, and who cannot find an honest industry and have been driven to a dishonest one.

Now, let us imagine for a moment a cargo of the London "slaveys" landed on our shores; those who open the doors of London lodging-houses, the Tilly Slowboys of Dickens. Food, that inalienable right of every servant, has been denied them; they have pined for good bread and meat, or have been fed on pernicious diet in the back alley of a London lodging-house. The careless, unfeeling, avaricious employer is well known to us who travel. The kitchen larder would be too heavy an item of expense did the white slave receive sufficient wholesome food. Hard work and late hours have made severe exactions on her health, but

perhaps a brother is about to emigrate to America, and the slavey has saved enough to come with him. Hundreds of such girls do come. Perhaps this insufficiency of food has made her dishonest (poor thing ! an Arctic voyager will eat anything when he is mad with hunger) ; she steals a little when she is first taken into an American kitchen, with its liberal supplies. The sense of honor and honesty is deadened in such a creature, of course. But if she were well taught and well trained, and if she learned that honesty were the best policy (having tried both), she might become the most useful, as well as the most trustworthy, of servants.

The business of these noble women who should teach servants should also extend to the mistresses. The duties of servants should be closely defined, reasonable, and fixed. It is astonishing how little friction there is in some families where all this is done by the mistress. She can then hold her domestic distinctly responsible, as a master carpenter can define to his men that such a board must be six inches long and another ten and a half. And to do so, make the servant feel that she has an interest and a stake in the whole body politic ; let her position be reasonable, established, and understood, and she will, in nine cases out of ten, do her work willingly and well, and in the shortest space of time.

Regular and sufficient sleep is essential to the health of servants, and here the mistress comes in for her bit of training. The late hours of society and fashion tell heavily on the higher class of fashionable servantdom. Porters, grooms, footmen, coachmen, butlers, housekeepers, cooks, ladies' maids, are all harassed and injured by the turning of day into night and night into day. A thoughtful mistress will see to this, and have her night work done by different relays ; and so, in the country, in small households, the nurse who is deprived of her rest must be relieved.

But what to do with the slovenly, unregulated heathens, and what to do without them—that is the question. Can no Baron Rumford arise and do for New York and Boston and Philadelphia and Chicago, for Utica and Cooperstown and Exeter and Manchester, for Worcester and for New Haven, for Hartford and Peoria, what he did for Munich, and bring rich and poor together ? Here is, to speak not too figuratively, a large, red-armed, strong German girl on one side of the street, saying, " Give me work or

I perish!" On the other side is the pale wife of the lawyer or doctor or minister, saying, "Send me some help, or I faint"; and the two never come together. Where is the missing link? It is to this end that the strong and willing girl should be found and educated, and sent into the rural districts, that she should be helped to find what would be to her the greatest boon, exactly such a place as the house of a modest yet comfortable family who would be glad of her service for a reasonable wage. That would be the sort of home that a Norwegian, a Swede, a German, a Swiss, or an English girl would be glad to find, one would suppose.

Now, in the cities and amongst opulent people there is the same complaint, usually, of the lack of fidelity to engagements. Here, again, the employers need education. They enter upon the engaging of servants too hastily, and perhaps part with them too inconsiderately. Servants cannot perform impossibilities, nor can they adapt themselves at once to the fresh habits of fresh people. Those who begin by promising everything are generally the first to perform very little, and those who are sufficiently honest for self-assertion are occasionally rejected as inflexible and impertinent. Too much pliancy is inconsistent with the firmness of truth, and the other extreme is apt to be sycophancy and deceit. "Fancy" is, however, an insufficient guide in the hiring of a servant, and therefore we must fall back on the written testimonial and character.

Here, it is to be feared, the best of women are not always true to themselves. It is said that a lady sometimes gives a good character to a bad servant to get rid of her; and yet how difficult it is to write the character of a servant! One wishes to be as kind as the case will allow, and "not stand in the poor girl's way." One reasons thus: What is objected to by one family may not be by another; what one would consider a great fault would be no fault in another; and the unsuitableness of a servant for one place would be fitness for another. Perhaps as a servant leaves us we forget the annoyance she has caused, and only see a poor creature in search of bread and the money to support a poor mother. So the "character paper" has become a rather useless piece of composition. One often takes a cook whose "character" pictures her a *cordon bleu*, and she proves unequal to the roasting of veal. Where, one asks, are these *plats*

which Mrs. Goodhearte so eloquently describes? Where the light bread and the neat kitchen? Not *chez nous*.

On one point ladies should not be dissimulators, either to themselves or to their friends. A drunkard should not be handed along, nor a woman notoriously bad-tempered or unneat. There will be little, if any, marked improvement among our female servants until ladies are more careful about the giving of characters. The great demand for domestic servants teaches them that, if they leave a place on Monday, they can get another before Saturday; and, indeed, many women live that way, getting their whole month's wage many times over, and only doing two or three days' work for it, perhaps intentionally making themselves impossible. In this respect the law should be called in to protect employers, who are at the present moment the most "unprotected females" in the world. Servants should learn that they cannot get good testimonials without having earned them and deserved them; secondly, that they cannot get good places so easily without characters.

It is a thousand pities that servants should be "changed" so frequently. What some one said of a belle, that she changed her mind toward her admirers as often as Mrs. Marchanay changed her servants, will express what one means. A continuance of service is the only thing which can lead to that faithful performance of one's duties which makes the old servant so respectable. How glad one is to see a familiar hospitable door opened by the same man twice or three times! Nowadays, in America, the old family servant, once so useful, so respected, so beloved, is almost a *rara avis*. Servants are becoming a separate community; our enemies, rather than our humble friends; a lava-bed beneath our feet, full of danger and pitfalls and hidden honeycombing. They have little or nothing in common with the families with whom they live. Their joys and sorrows, their employments in their spare time, their pursuits, aims, and friendships, are all alien to those of the family whose roof shelters them. Were it not for the blessed interposition of children, there would be no chord of attachment, no bond of union, between the family and those who serve them. The latter are unknown strangers for everything except work and duty. Is it, therefore, to be wondered at that they are faithless? We treat dogs and horses much more reasonably; we make them love us, we feed

them, we bespeak them gently, we praise and we notice them. Surely, in the practical working of domestic life, there should be more mutual good will.

Let no mistress be afraid that she may break down her authority or make herself common, or would be likely to evoke a response of impertinence, by being kind to her servants. It is not kindness, but an injudicious use of kindness, which makes anybody rude who ought to be respectful and deferentially civil and grateful. A kind mistress finds a safe and a royal way to the hearts of her servants, by taking an interest in their health, their pursuits, even their tastes. They grow to love her and to kiss the hem of her garments, if they see that she is thinking of them as being human. If she is grateful for an unexpected service, she need indulge in no undignified familiarity. Indeed, they will respect her the more if she is stern with them, so far as her duty requires her to be; but if she is sympathetic, her gentle and intelligent manner of being firm will correct the flippancies of a careless and ignorant servant; it will put a heart into the faithful blunderer who would "like to please." The mistress will not receive an eye-service, a perfunctory service, a mechanical service, but a real service.

As for the accomplished servants, none equal the French as cooks, waiters, laundresses, and ladies' maids; they are peerless, and it is ever an experiment worthy of trial—the employment of the humbler and comparatively untaught rural French as household servants. The Parisians soon get haughty and disdainful, and throw us over as being unworthy of their steel. Even if we do not, being the worm, turn, when too much trodden on, and send them back to their native shores at our own expense, regarding ourselves as worthy to avenge their steel, or steal, they are great rascals sometimes, particularly the *chefs*. Others are perfectly trustworthy, and as for manners they are almost as agreeable as negroes; which was once saying a great deal. It is to be feared that "freedom from her mountain height" has screeched rather too loudly, and has half impaired that nameless grace which once hung about the delightful old negress in her colored turban, who loved the young "Mars" so well and to her death served her "Mess Maria." One might go into the subject of the ballot, and whether it has been a boon to the negro. One could write an essay on the manners of the colored coachmen and waiters at

Washington; but there are some epics which are more eloquent unwritten, perhaps.

The story of the unfaithful servant is as old as human history, and we have not yet reached the Molière period, when the valet comes into comedy as the most important functionary on the dramatic side of life. The servant is disappearing. In our history there is a fear of his becoming extinct—a species of dodo. It is not the question of his non-ability, but of his nonentity, that troubles us. He is not there; his undusted chair awaits him. It is the curious lack of sequence which troubles us. Why, then, is it that the mistress stands on one side of the street and the maid on the other awaiting the signal? The one beckons; the other does not see. Who will find the open sesame, the talismanic word? Where are they, faithful or unfaithful? Are they to be found on the docks?

The first impediment in the way of the lady philanthropist will be to meet and forestall the rush which is made for all available female help by the intelligence-office men, who seize these newly-arrived immigrants for the great hotels and summer watering-places. A landlord of one of the largest of these says that he takes these girls, not asking for characters, and makes them work under a grim housekeeper, only anxious that they should be neat about the tables and bedrooms, and leaving it to their own sense of propriety to dress themselves becomingly. As for lovers, and their amusements after their work is done, he asks no questions. This cannot be a very good school for domestic servants, and very few ladies will take a domestic who has only this background. I happened to talk with a pleasant-faced Norwegian girl at a Western hotel last winter who was a chambermaid, and she deplored this state of things. She said that her countrywomen would like permanent homes, but that the money to be earned in hotels was much greater. They could retire sooner, and get married, or return to Norway. She said the life in hotels was very hard, especially as many girls are put to sleep in one large room, coming in at all hours of the night, chattering and singing, and keeping those awake who desired a quiet night's rest. She declared herself quite anxious to go to some retired spot where she could live in a family, but she said no one would take her with only a hotel recommendation.

There is such a prejudice in the American mind against house-

hold service that I wish there could be a medal offered by the State—a sort of *rosière* business, a flitch-of-bacon reward, or some of the old feudal customs revived—to reward the successful competitor for the power to be a good kitchen maid. It should be made an order of nobility, and then we might have some hope that our rural gentry could be served well in their own houses, as their fathers and mothers have been.

It is instructive to read in this connection an admirable paper by the clever writer, Katherine Pearson Woods, on the "Queens of the Shop, the Workroom, and the Tenement," to learn what painful and really unnecessary sufferings a woman will undergo rather than to take the comforts of a place in a respectable family, where she would be fed and warmed and cared for, well paid, if only she would accept the profession of domestic service, "honorable amongst all men" and historically and poetically noble. Mrs. Woods says: "To enumerate the different trades by which women in New York are endeavoring, not to live,—that for many of them is as utterly unattainable a goal as the end of the rainbow,—but simply to postpone as long as possible their appearance at the morgue or in the cemetery—to attempt to do this would be useless." She goes on to describe the girls who work in soap-factories and whose business it is to wrap the separate cakes, while hot, in paper. The caustic soda used in the manufacture first turns their nails yellow, then eats away the ends of their fingers. There seems no way to help this, as the deftness of touch required would be, of course, impossible if the worker wore gloves. It is, indeed, only possible to a given set of workers for a very short time, but there are always plenty to take their places when they drop out! What becomes of these poor mutilated creatures no one asks.

But might it not be possible to save them from this terrible doom, if we had training-schools for servants, as for nurses, where they could be supported while learning their trade, and apprenticed for five years after? Could we not find capitalists in great rich America who would endow such schools, far more needed than public libraries or Cornell University, where the great lack of domestic service could be filled, and girls saved from the making of arsenical artificial flowers, poisonous dyed feathers, the nicotine paralysis, and the soap cakes? Must we continue to have the "Song of the Shirt," and the "Sweater"? As Mrs. Woods says

at the end of a most impressive article, "God help us all, unless we change this state of things."

I asked my Norwegian friend why the girls coming from the lonely pastures of her native land were so anxious to avoid the country and to herd together in cities. "Oh!" said she, "it saves the homesickness." Perhaps there is a great truth hidden here, which the philanthropic men of America would do well to study. It might be a part of the training-school to find out how to enliven these lonely lives, so that the great rush for the overcrowded town, with its dismal tragedies, could be avoided. It is worth consideration, and I cannot but hope that some Mrs. Fry, Mrs. Howard, Florence Nightingale, or Louisa Lee Schuyler may take it up.

"I need the counsel of thy larger thought." I have seen in the course of years, during which time I have employed many servants, the great need of instruction, and how grateful a girl is to be taught. Any lady who knows a little about cooking can by patience make a fairly good cook out of very raw material in a few months. The influence of a refined household tells on the almost savage nature in a short time. The worst of this is that the accomplished servant will leave her patient instructor, and go off to "fresh woods and pastures new" and to higher wages, and here is the first duty of the philanthropic schoolteacher; the servant must be taught the moral obligation to stay where she is wanted.

We can never have the "perfect service" in a republic, but we can do a great deal better than we are doing. We can take a lesson from the founders of the constitution, who so well contrived to put it into the head of every American citizen that he was the most important brick in the building, and that on him must all depend, that most American men work well for themselves, for the State, and for the Union. When we can so educate a trained domestic service that the women employed find that they are doing the best for themselves, as well as for us, in being good cooks and laundresses, good nurses and maids, we shall have solved one of the great problems of the nineteenth century.

This might well become an international question, and kindly women might combine with their English, Norwegian, Swedish sisters as to these girls, who should be sent fresh from their own homes to their American homes. I know all about Miss Emily Faithfull's efforts and her failure, but I think that it was

because she attempted too much, and with too little help on the other side. Now that organizations are so possible and thorough as we see in the woman's temperance societies and in many philanthropic and artistic combinations, why should we not attempt the importation of female servants who, being helped and educated, shall be bound by some contract to stay in their places until their education is paid for—that education not being Shakespeare and the musical glasses, not French or Italian, not the piano (excepting to dust it), but the finer and rarer art of making a house pleasant to live in, of cooking an eatable dinner, of doing the work of a kitchen neatly and well.

M. E. W. SHERWOOD.

OUR BUSINESS PROSPECTS.

BY CHARLES STEWART SMITH, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

THE extreme money stringency, or panic, so generally anticipated and predicted some months since, has not arrived. Two principal causes have operated to prevent it: first, the business world prepared for it by getting out of debt as rapidly as possible; and, secondly, the enormous crops of all kinds in this country and the certainty of a large European demand for our surplus at good prices have created confidence in the immediate future, which has been reflected in the Wall Street barometer by the recent considerable advance in stocks, which foreign capitalists have quite recently been disposed to buy for "quick turns" on the market, while they avoid permanent investments in good American railroad bonds, with which our bankers and corporations are now burdened because of the distrust prevailing abroad regarding the permanancy of our gold standard.

With assured prosperity in the agricultural interests, a financial panic is impossible in the United States.

Although the late crisis in England, occasioned by the embarrassment of the Barings and over-speculation, was followed in this country by the shipment of seventy millions of gold to Europe, yet it was essentially a private banker's disturbance; and it incidentally, and by reflection only, affected the commercial interests of this country. Still prudent merchants "shortened sail" and waited developments. This caused a serious depression in business for a time, from which it has not yet fully recovered.

The industrial and commercial establishments of this country are to-day upon a sound, conservative basis. There is no inclination towards speculation, and they are more cautious than usual in incurring obligations. Collections have been better than the

average during the summer, and the demands for money from merchants less than usual.

A glance at the situation of some of our leading industries will confirm the above observation and serve as an illustration of the general condition.

There is a larger aggregation of capital engaged in the production of textile fabrics than in any other manufacturing industry in the United States. We have fifteen and a half millions of cotton-spindles, which, including the complete equipment of the mills, represent, in the competent opinion of Mr. Edward Atkinson, a capital of $232,500,000; and it would be a conservative estimate, based upon the census reports for 1880, to assume that the invested capital of the woollen, silk, and other mixed-textile manufactures, including bleacheries, dye-works, etc., is at present $225,000,000 in addition. The capital employed in the various commission, wholesale, and retail agencies for the sale of textile fabrics would at least equal the amount engaged in manufacturing. We thus arrive at the enormous total of more than $900,000,000 engaged in this industry, with its attendant traffic.

Of carpets we are the largest producers in the world, and in design, colors, and quality our goods are quite equal to anything made in Europe of competing grades; of silk, we exceed in amount the product of England and Germany, and are second only to France; and in plain silks (in which we excel as respects quality and durability) we equal the product of the most famous looms of Lyons.

The large corporations of New England engaged in cotton-manufacture have had, as indicated by their last half-yearly dividends, average success, notwithstanding the fact that the average prices of cotton fabrics for the past six months have been the lowest known in the history of the trade in the United States, even in the times of exceptional temporary panic or depression; the quotations of the stocks of the leading mills are generally above par, and in many cases at a large premium; and for a series of years the return to the investor has been more profitable and steady than the average railroad earnings of this country.

Although an English cotton mill costs to build and equip fully 33⅓ per cent. less than ours, and while labor in such mills is 20 per cent. less in England than here (in some industries the

difference is much greater), it is an interesting fact that one may buy the low and medium grades of cotton goods of the class used by the masses, or a ready-made garment of the same, say of shirtings, calico, gingham, canton flannel, and the like, in the retail stores of New York and Chicago, quite as low as a similar article can be bought in London, Paris, or Berlin. American standard sheetings and drills have the preference in the Chinese market, and are sold in competition with English- and German-made goods, and always at better prices because of their superior quality. The product of favorite brands of American standard sheetings and drills adapted to the China markets have been sold in advance of production for more than six months past, and a prominent mill has now 10,000 packages engaged for the African market.

It is a humiliating fact that every bale of New England-made goods destined for China is shipped by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Vancouver and from thence to its destination by English steamers, and this large traffic has been diverted from the American railways and from the Pacific Mail steamers because that line of steamers has not heretofore been able to compete with the English Government subsidy.

It has been proved that we can successfully compete with Europe in the Oriental markets, in the manufacture and sale of plain cotton goods, when the cost of labor in producing a piece of goods does not exceed 25 per cent. of the total cost. I have seen recently a stylish and appropriate summer morning dress, made from a colored American cotton dress fabric by a young lady with her own fingers, where the cost of the material did not exceed one dollar and a quarter. A ready-made suit of clothes for a man, of common American cassimere, will not cost in New York to-day 15 per cent. more than a similar suit bought in London; and this excess in cost is due to the increased cost of wool here and to the fact that the percentage of labor-cost upon the cassimere is relatively six times as much as on the cotton fabrics above referred to.

It must be admitted that the woollen and worsted industry of this country has been less uniformly successful and has experienced far more fluctuation during the past twenty years than the cotton industry; and this has been due mainly to the tariff and its interpretation.

While I yield to no one in the belief that experience, which in the end settles all questions of theory, has demonstrated that a reasonable protective tariff is the true economic policy for the United States, still I am of the opinion, in opposition to our present policy, that a very low tariff upon wool, or free wool, would benefit alike the manufacturer and the wool-grower, and would place both interests upon a firmer basis of prosperity. It would enable the manufacturer to largely increase, as well as diversify, the production; it would create a larger demand for American wools, for mixing with foreign, and increase the price to the farmer.

Except for the general and mistaken prejudice of the wool-grower, to which the law-making power has yielded, there is no more reason, even from the Protectionist's standpoint, why our tariff-makers should place a duty upon the low grades of wool known as carpet wools than upon indigo or any other article not produced in this country.

The growth of the iron industry, notably within the last five years, is simply marvellous. The census of 1880 gives the invested capital of the iron and steel industry as $230,971,884. We are without the figures of the late census, but it is fair to assume, as the production has increased during the last decade two and a half times, that the capital may now be estimated at $450,000,000. The Hon. A. S. Hewitt, than whom there is no better authority, estimates that it requires $1,000 capital for every man employed in the manufacture of iron. Notwithstanding the enormous expansion in this industry, the returns to the manufacturers have been reasonably satisfactory. The group of corporations connected with the name of the distinguished author of the "Gospel of Wealth"* is reported upon trustworthy authority to have been phenomenally prosperous during the year 1890. A prominent iron-manufacturer states:

"We have made more money in our mills in 1890 and 1891 by rigid economy than for several years past, and my experience is presumably not exceptional. There has been no important failure in the iron trade for twelve months past, although the price of iron is very low, lower than for many years. An owner of a mill who is selling iron freely at the lowest price named by any one in this country, informed me that they declared a 9 per cent. dividend last year; it is proper to add, however, that large profits have only been made on the production of specialties covered by patents, and not upon plain staples which are open to general competition."

* Mr. Andrew Carnegie.

The iron trade of the United States has had in the past so many periods of severe depression that manufacturers have been obliged to study all sorts of labor-saving methods in order to decrease the cost of production; there is no other country in the world where so much is accomplished by such devices as in the United States, in all branches of manufacturing—*i. e.*, more labor per man is performed in the United States than elsewhere. While the iron industry has felt more severely the depression of last spring and the fall in prices than most other trades, because of the almost total cessation of railroad construction and extension, still the outlook is encouraging. Iron and steel are more and more, each year, used in buildings of all kinds, and new outlets are constantly opening for these products.

I am sure that I am doing a favor to my readers by calling their attention to the exceedingly able and interesting address of Mr. Hewitt delivered in September, 1890, before the American Institute of Mining Engineers, on "Iron and Labor," not only because of its comprehensive history of the iron and coal trades, but also for its instructive lessons on social questions connected with the relations of capital and labor.

The report of the American Iron and Steel Association, issued in April last, is the authority for most of the statistics given below. The production of pig iron in the United States, given in net tons, was in the year 1872, 2,854,558; 1880, 4,295,414; 1886, 6,365,328; 1890, 10,307,028; from 1872 to 1878 the product decreased. The increase of production from 1888 to 1889 was 17 per cent.; from 1889 to 1890, 21 per cent. The production of 1890 was about 1,200,000 gross tons larger than that of Great Britain for the same year, and it was 600,000 gross tons larger than the largest year Great Britain ever had, thus placing the United States at the head of the iron-producing countries of the world. Iron was made in twenty-three States of our country in 1890. The total production of Bessemer-steel ingots in the United States was, in 1890, 3,688,871 gross tons, an increase of nearly 26 per cent. over the production of 1889. Great Britain's largest production of Bessemer-steel ingots was in 1889, when it amounted to 2,140,793 gross tons. Our production of steel rails in 1889 was 1,691,264 net tons; in 1890, 2,091,978 net tons. The largest annual production of Great Britain was in 1882, when it amounted to 1,235,785 gross tons.

Wire nails (nearly all steel), although comparatively a recent development, have become very important. The production in 1890 was 3,135,911 kegs of 100 pounds each. This branch of the trade was built up under a protective duty of 4 cents per pound. The McKinley Bill reduced this duty to 2 cents per pound. These nails are now selling by first hands at $1\frac{90}{100}$ cents per pound, or ten mills less per pound than the present duty. The rods from which these wire nails are made were formerly largely imported from England. The price of the American rod is $37.50 per ton. The first cost of the English rod would be $31.78; add duty of $13.72, making total $45.50. American steel nails are quoted at $5.50 per ton less than they can be imported to-day with the duty of $13.72 added. The last-mentioned facts demonstrate that the cost of an article is not always in a high-tariff country "the foreign cost plus the duty."

As the presence of coal fields is indispensable to the production of iron in any country, it is interesting to note that the increase of our coal production has kept pace with that of iron, with which it is so closely associated.

1870.....Coal mined, tons.....	28,312,581
1880..... " " "	65,883,000
1889..... " " "	137,445,172*

Our excessive silver coinage is the one dark, ominous shadow which projects itself over the country, plainly indicating disaster. If this danger could be eliminated by the common-sense of the people operating upon Congress, there is no question that an era of permanent prosperity would open before the nation. The wise remarks of the President at Albany indicate that there is no prospect of free silver coinage during the present administration; but the introduction of free coinage of silver is not the only thing necessary to cause the withdrawal of gold as a circulating medium. The monthly purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion, with its attendant issue of treasury notes, will, in my opinion, inevitably produce this result. It is highly probable that gold would have sold at a premium before Christmas of this year had it not been for our large crops and the universally short crops of cereals in Europe.

As an illustration of the value of the present crops as affecting the prosperity of the country, one of the most prominent and intelligent citizens of the State of Kansas writes:

* These figures are from Mr. Hewitt's address on "Iron and Labor."

"There are thousands of farms in Kansas that have produced crops which can be sold for a sum greater than the actual valuation one year ago of the farms themselves. One instance has come under my observation of a farm, fairly valued at $4,500, producing a crop which has been sold for $8,000. It is stated on good authority that either of the items of property, horses, cattle, hogs, wheat, and corn, could be sold for a sum equal to the mortgage indebtedness of all of the farmers of Kansas, and leave them in possession of the four remaining items."

Within the past four months and before our present crops were assured, while money was loaned at 4½ per cent. in Wall street on six months' credit and payable at maturity in gold, the currency rate was at the same time 6 per cent. This danger-signal will be likely to fly again when the reverse of the position of to-day is realized—*i. e.*, the occurence of short crops in this country with abundant harvests in Europe. Prudent loaners of money, such as savings banks and trust companies, will then necessarily insert gold clauses in their mortgages for self-protection.

The exports and imports of the United States, exclusive of gold, for the year ending June 30, 1891, were $1,729,378,862, with a balance of about forty millions in our favor. This vast exchange was all upon a gold basis, and in accordance with the finances of Europe.

Those who were engaged in foreign trade during the late Civil War will need no reminder of the difficulty and uncertainty that always environ all transactions which represent obligations payable in gold with receipts receivable in a depreciated currency.

If the question is asked, "When will gold sell at a premium under the existing state of things?" an obvious and reasonable reply would be: Gold will be withdrawn from circulation, and the hoarding of this metal will commence whenever the time arrives that importers and foreign bankers believe that it is probable in the near future that a check drawn upon a bank in New York will not be received in payment of a bill of exchange drawn on London.

All prudent men engaged in foreign trade will then convert as speedily as possible their deposits into gold, and the catastrophe of a premium on gold will be at hand. The large banks and bankers of Europe have, before this impending danger, been willing to leave liberal cash balances in the hands of their agents

in this country because of the higher rates for money usually prevailing here. Of course the probability of a premium on gold would cause all floating capital of this kind to be withdrawn, unless promises to pay in gold, with all the attendant risks, were entered into on the part of American dealers in foreign exchange.

The Secretary of the Treasury has the power and discretion by act of Congress to issue bonds for the purpose of maintaining the present parity between gold and silver; and Secretary Foster in a recent interview with New York bankers expressed his determination to use this power for that purpose to its fullest extent; but it is not probable that Congress, with its well-known tendency to free coinage, would permit this power to remain long in the nands of the government should such an exigency arise. In the opinion of some of the most experienced bankers and financiers of this country, we have to-day coin and currency of all sorts (gold excepted) sufficient for the needs of the nation. The demands for more currency are fallacious. The idea prevails in some sections, as demonstrated in a recent Ohio political convention, that increased currency and free coinage of silver will give additional capital to those who are at present without accumulated savings of their own. Was there ever a more absurd proposition submitted to an intelligent people? Money flows by a natural law to the money-centres, or where there is concentrated capital. What our free-coinage friends need is increased earnings, and not more currency and silver coins. The Treasury Department and the banks of New York will be glad to send them all the eighty-cent silver dollars and all the national-bank notes and silver bills they can pay for, provided only that the express charges are borne by the receivers. It must be admitted, however, that the Eastern banks are very reluctant to part with their gold reserves, as every bank manager knows.

In financial circles there is so much sensitiveness regarding the gold reserve of the government in the treasury, which is less than 20 per centum of the outstanding obligations, subject to redemption in gold, if the gold standard is maintained, that it would be regarded as an unfriendly act on the part of any national bank to send one-half million greenbacks to the assistant treasurer for redemption in gold coin.

A conspicuous instance very recently came to light in New

York, by which it appeared that a prominent bank loaned a million of dollars for fifteen days without interest to a foreign banker for the purpose of importing gold from England, with the agreement that as a compensation for the loss of interest the gold so imported should be added to the reserve of the bank, and this was considered a wise move at the time.

At this writing the platform of the Democratic State Convention is announced. It is a matter of great importance and a good omen for the future that both political parties in this State are united in opposition to the free coinage of silver and in favor of honest money.

CHARLES STEWART SMITH.

WOMEN IN ENGLISH POLITICS.

BY JUSTIN McCARTHY, M. P.

MANY a year is in its grave since I wrote an article in an American magazine which I called "The Petticoat in English Politics." The difference between that title and the name I give to this article is more than a mere difference of words. It represents an actual difference in conditions, in facts, in the ideas which I desire to convey. For I think any one would at once understand that to speak of the influence of the petticoat in politics is to speak of a purely feminine influence, potent because it is feminine, while the influence of women in politics gives the idea of the influence which women exercise as politicians in the open field—not as women playing on the weaknesses of men and cajoling and manipulating them and making instruments of them. The one title represents what Stuart Mill used to call the illegitimate influence of women; the other their legitimate influence. This is exactly the idea which I sought to convey in my former article and which I seek to convey in this. I was writing then of the illegitimate influence of woman in English politics; I am writing now of her legitimate influence.

Only seventeen or eighteen years have passed, and in that interval the position of woman in the public life of England has wholly changed. Then there was hardly anything that could be called a legitimate influence of woman making itself felt in the political affairs of England. There were, to be sure, various organizations for obtaining the suffrage and free employment for women; and I think the experiment of admitting women to seats on the school boards had just begun to be tried. But not much impression on the old order had been made, and the influence of women on political life was an influence exercised over men and through men; an influence of the drawing-room and the *salon*—an influence, in short, of the petticoat.

Now the state of things has greatly changed. The influence of the petticoat has gone down ever so much, and that of the woman has come up. In this conservative old country the cause of woman's rights has made far greater progress than with you in the United States. When our first system of national education was started,—only think, it is but a few years since we established our first really national system of education in England,—women were allowed to be elected to the school boards. People then went to look on at the meetings of the London School Board out of mere curiosity to see the women members sitting there. When two years ago our county councils were formed, the act of Parliament did not make it quite clear whether women were or were not eligible as members. Some women stood for the London council and other councils. Three, I think, were elected for London. One was Lady Sandhurst, the widow of a famous soldier; another bore a name well known in America—Miss Jane Cobden. The rival over whom Lady Sandhurst had prevailed—a man—disputed her legal right to sit, and brought an action, the result of which was that she was declared to be disqualified. In the other two cases no attempt was made to claim the seats, and the ladies therefore remain and sit and speak and vote until the law is made more clear one way or the other and the question finally settled. Now, I do not in the least blame the man who went to law with Lady Sandhurst for her seat. He was accused of being ungallant; but, after all, these are serious questions not to be settled by a mere tender of unsolicited courtesy to woman's sex. I am sure Lady Sandhurst would not have thanked her opponent for telling her that as a woman she must be humored and must be allowed to have her own way in everything. But there can be no doubt as to the manner in which the controversy will end. The act will be modified so as to make it clear that women are eligible for the county councils. Then the distance is not far to the Parliamentary franchise for women.

Just at present we have two schools of policy as regards the Parliamentary suffrage for women. Women themselves are divided on the question. One division of the party advocate the seeking of the suffrage only for women who have what I may call the householder's qualification. The householder, the person responsible for the rent and the rates, is the person who ought to

have the vote, no matter what that person's sex may be. This looks a fair as well as a moderate demand. But see what it comes to. It means that, speaking generally, all married women shall be disqualified. The vast majority of married women are not registered as householders. The husband is the householder and the husband has the vote. Of course there would be exceptions in the case of some women of property who have houses of their own, as well as their husbands' houses, and who are the registered owners of their own houses. But these exceptions do not much affect the general fact that the household suffrage leaves the married women out. The women voters would be spinsters and widows. The other, or more advanced, division of the woman-suffrage movement go boldly in for the good wife having the vote as well as the good man. They contend that before long there will be what is virtually manhood suffrage in these countries. Indeed, it almost amounts to that already. Therefore they may argue that there should at the same time be womanhood suffrage. According to the principle which the less advanced reformers are contending for, a man's mistress, as it often has been said, might have the vote, while his wife would be prevented by law from having it.

The actual movement, the political and constitutional movement, has not been making any very marked progress of late. In the House of Commons it has been rather at a standstill. The loss of Mr. Courtney as a leader was a real loss indeed. Mr. Courtney is a man of high political position and influence, a strong man with a firm will, who could not be bent or played with by evasive ministers of the crown. But Mr. Courtney was appointed to the office of chairman of committees,—the office, it may be called, of deputy speaker,—and it would not be suitable that he should lead a party in the House any more. The present leader of the older and less advanced movement is Mr. Walter McLaren, a young member who has not yet had a chance of showing what he can do. All I can say of him is that he comes of a good stock. His mother is a sister of John Bright; his father was a man of great practical ability who sat in the House of Commons for many years and was much respected there; his brother was in the House for some years and will no doubt be there again, and he was noted for tenacity in sticking to a purpose.

But the whole question of woman suffrage has been shoved

aside by controversies of more imminent and pressing interest. It is an axiom in Parliament now that until the Irish question is settled nothing else can be seriously taken up. In any case the woman-suffrage cause will have to be worked with far greater energy in Parliament when its time comes—or else its time will never come. The House of Commons never makes a reform simply because the reform is one that ought to be made. It makes a reform only because and when it has to be made. Incessant pressure must be brought to bear by those who have a movement in hand. They must make themselves disagreeable, intolerable, to each and every government, until at last some government finds it necessary to come to terms with them, take the reform out of their hands, and carry it as a measure of administration. It would not be too much to say that in the imperial Parliament no measure is ever carried through by a private member or even by an independent party. That is not the way in which success is obtained. The independent party has to keep pegging away with its proposal, to try to force it on the attention of the House ; to ballot for days on which it may be brought on ; to make it a test question at elections ; to throw the voting strength of the party against any and every candidate who will not pledge himself to support its reform ; to vote in the House of Commons against every ministry who will not promise to give it a fair consideration to; make the question an inconvenient and disturbing influence for ministry and opposition alike. Then at last the opposition takes it up, and perhaps compels the government to adopt it and bring in a measure of their own to carry out the reform. Thus and not otherwise are reforms carried in England. Governments in this country are unlike *Falstaff* and his reasons—they will give anything on compulsion.

The woman-suffrage party have not worked energetically enough so far. I am speaking now merely of what ought to be, from the point of view of those who lead the movement. Personally and politically I feel grateful to them for their quietude ; for I am deeply concerned in a great question of the most pressing interest, and I am glad that they have not intervened too persistently with their own work and thus helped to delay the other. But they will have sooner or later to make themselves very disagreeable if they are determined to have anything speedily done. Meanwhile the interval of what may almost be called

Parliamentary inaction is by no means an interval of general inactivity. The country is being rapidly and incessantly educated up to the woman-suffrage principle. For instance, we have none of us any longer any feeling of curiosity, any idea of eccentricity, when we hear a woman called on to deliver a speech at a public meeting. On both sides of the political field women exert themselves in a manner which might make Aristophanes turn in his grave. On many platforms now women are speakers as regularly as men. Women of high social position, women of aristocratic rank, are ready to address a public meeting.

One of the most marvellous political organizations of our days is the Primrose League. This is really a league of Tory ladies got up to supply the deficiencies of energy and of eloquence which were to be observed in the organizations of the Tory men. Lysistrata herself might be proud of the spirit in which the dames of the Primrose League lead the way in their public demonstrations, and the tame and quiet manner in which the men have been trained to take the second place. The Primrose ladies do not confine their work to the making of speeches, although they do a vast amount of speech-making and some of them do it very well. They organize election arrangements; they canvass electors; they manage the work of the polling days; they lend their carriages to bring voters to the polling-places; they take voters in their carriages and personally charioteer them to the poll. As Napoleon said that the business of war consisted mainly in the bringing together of the greatest number of men at a given place and a given time, so the Primrose dames confidently maintain that the success of an election now is often only a question of bringing together the greatest number of carriages at a given place and a given time. They beat the Liberals in the number of carriages, it must be owned. To be sure, the Liberals have won nearly all the recent disputable bye-elections; but then there were tremendous questions involved which did not leave much margin for doubtful votes—and I should like to know where the Tories would have been but for their irrepressible, indomitable Primrose League!

On the Liberal side women have begun to organize and intervene now with steady purpose and sustained energy. Many women of birth and rank stump the country as Liberal agitators. Among the various Liberal delegations sent over to Ireland during the

last three years women have played a prominent and important part.

In London all the old influence of the *salon* has practically disappeared. No woman now plays in London life the part which was once played by Lady Palmerston. There is no political *salon* now in that sense. Some great ladies give parties which have political objects; but they are gatherings only of the one political set, and do not profess to aim at any business of propaganda and conversion. The suffrage is too wide-spread and deep-laid for such influences as those of the old *salon* to have any effect on an election now. In the old days many a man sat for a borough or county which might be said to belong to him; where his family were all-powerful. The suffrage was very high and narrow, and the electors were all more or less under his control. Now, suppose Lady Palmerston, on the eve of some great division in the House of Commons, were to manage to talk such a man over, and get him to vote for Lord Palmerston, instead of voting, as he had first intended to do, against him: there would be something decidedly gained for Lord Palmerston's cause. The member whom Lady Palmerston had converted would care nothing for the opinion of his constituents. He would bid his will avouch his vote; and when the next election came on his constituents would have to return him all the same.

But the condition of things is very different now. The despot of the old days has to be a very humble supplicant in these new days. Every peasant on the land has his vote, and votes under the protection of the ballot; and he can afford to withstand the little tyrant of his fields. Of what avail would be the blandishments of any Lady Palmerston for the member of Parliament who had the terror of Hodge's vote before his mind and his conscience? The *salon* is gone because the days of the *salon* are over. In its stead has come a new institution, led and officered for the most part by women; and this is the political garden party or the political drawing-room party. Some great lady throws her grounds and her house open on a fixed day, and the Primrose dames, on the one hand, or the Women's Liberal Association, on the other, get up a garden party or a drawing-room party. The services of some well-known Parliamentary orators are secured, and the whole affair is announced by widespread advertisement. Invitations are showered about, and there for

once the social barriers are utterly broken down. Men and women of all classes meet in those hospitable grounds and under that hospitable roof. The duchess and the dressmaker are standing side by side. The noble earl leans familiarly on the shoulder of the British workingman. If the noble earl is invited to address the meeting, be sure some British workingman will be invited to address it too. Happy above women is the fortunate hostess who can secure the presence of Mr. Gladstone on the one side or of Mr. Balfour, let us say, on the other.

Is all this sort of thing mere play-acting—mere farce—mere sham? I do not think so. I think there is a good deal of reality beneath the surface of it, and I am glad to see the classes brought together, anyhow. The state of things no longer admits of the ignoble relationship of the patron and the patronized. The workingman has his vote now; the working woman will have hers before very long; and in the meantime she is a figure and an influence in political life, and is not a creature to be merely patronized.

The truth is that the working classes in England are growing more powerful and the aristocracy are growing less powerful. It must be so. This country is governed by the House of Commons, and the House of Commons is governed by the constituencies; and the workingmen count for much in every constituency. I do not see the slightest decrease in the ambition of Englishmen of any class, any rank, to be members of the House of Commons. We are always told that the dignity and the attractiveness of the House of Commons are being lowered every day; that it is becoming a rough-and-tumble sort of assembly, and that men of high social position shrink from accepting seats in it. Do they? Some men in every class have always shrunk from a Parliamentary life. But do men of rank shrink from it now more than ever they did? Not the least in the world. I happen to know a good deal about English elections, and I never knew a time when men of high social position were more anxious to get a chance of coming into the House of Commons. Well, but to get into the House of Commons one must have some support from the workingman. The workingman gets to be regarded as an important person; and, all apart from any question of selfish advantage to be gained out of him and gained by paying court to him, the English aristocrat begins to see that he is a real personage; that he is a man and a brother; that there is something in him.

The same will be found true of the working women. Not very long ago I was one of the speakers at a meeting in Prince's Hall, in Piccadilly, which was presided over by Lord Dunraven, who is well known in the United States. It was a meeting called for the purpose of trying to bring about some better conditions of labor for the poor working women in the East End of London. Many men made good speeches,—peers and members of the House of Commons, and clergymen—there was even a bishop there—and Dissenting or Nonconformist ministers, who are usually endowed with a special gift of eloquence, which goes home to the heart of a popular audience. But the speech which interested me most was made by a working woman. It was not merely because she understood the practical question better than we did; it was not because, like the waitress whom Disraeli describes in his "Coningsby," through the mouth of his Sidonia, she was "mistress of her subject." Her expert knowledge, of course, counted for a great deal. But beyond this there was to my mind a remarkable capacity in her for taking at once a broad and a practical view of any subject; for recognizing the inevitable necessity of compromise; for accepting the conditions under which reform of any kind has to be made; for admitting limitations. Besides all this, there was a certain composure about her; a certain dignity of manner. She was neither obtrusive nor diffident. She seemed to say in effect: "You must take me as I am; I don't pretend to be a lady, in the conventional sense of the word, and I don't pretend to be a good speaker, but I have something to say and I want to say it. I am not anxious to make a speech, but I have something to say to you which ought to be said."

Now, I think that woman personified fairly the best aspect of the woman's movement in England. I think woman is coming forward because she has something to say which she feels ought to be said. This is the strictly legitimate influence of woman. It is not the influence of the petticoat. It is the intelligence of woman coming to the help of the intelligence of man. I am utterly unable to see how this comradeship in the management of affairs can either lower the dignity of man or unsex the nature of woman. may say at once that I am an utter disbeliever in the possibility of unsexing woman, or man either. I am very fond of reading Ovid's "Metamorphoses"; but I disbelieve some of the stories.

The education of women is advancing every day. We have colleges for girls now in England just as you have in America. I have been reading an interesting article in the monthly magazine *Atalanta* on Oxford and Cambridge colleges for women, by the Honorable Eva Knatchbull-Hugessen, who is a daughter of Lord Brabourne, and who was herself educated at Newnham College, Cambridge. Both Oxford and Cambridge have now opened all their examinations to women; Cambridge is no longer alone in this advance. There are four colleges from which a girl can choose. She may go to Girton or to Newnham, at Cambridge; she may go to Lady Margaret Hall or Somerville Hall, at Oxford. A girl, although she cannot obtain a degree, can, Miss Knatchbull-Hugessen tells us, "go through exactly the same course of study as her brother, be it classics, mathematics, science, history, or modern languages." Of course the working girl has not much to do with Girton or Lady Margaret Hall, but there are institutions growing up everywhere in England which aim at the education and the training of the working girl—and I am by no means certain that the young Englishwoman of good position did not want her education looked after quite as much in proportion as her lowly-born and hard-working sister. All this development of education among high and low will not only tend to make women fit to have an influence on public life, but will inevitably make them anxious to exert that influence.

When the popular franchise was carried in 1867, against the uttermost efforts of Robert Lowe, now Lord Sherbrooke, Lowe exclaimed that the time had come "to educate our masters." The workingmen, he said, were to become our masters by virtue of the franchise and their numbers, and the only thing left for us to do was to educate them, so that at least they might understand how to exercise a wholesome dominion over us. I do not know whether the women, when they get the franchise, are going to be our masters. They will have the advantage of numbers certainly, and if it should come to a continuous struggle of women as women against men as men, we should have to give in. But I am not afraid of these portentous eventualities which have a terror for so many persons of both sexes. I have not seen women very much in antagonism with men, and I have noticed that the world here in England has gone on in very much the same, orderly sort of humdrum way since women have been

sitting on the school boards and the county councils. But I am very glad indeed that the education of women is given over to something better than the old-fashioned "boarding-school for young ladies"—the school at which Amelia Sedley learned and Becky Sharp taught. I am glad that the discipline of a regular college is applied to the instruction and training of young women as well as of young men. Perhaps the education of women of the poorer class, as well as the richer, is a little overdone here and there. Perhaps there is a good deal too much of cramming. Everything gets overdone somewhere. Cramming is a good deal too much the practice in England for boys as well as for girls—for boys, indeed, much more than for girls. But it is impossible to found or devise any educational system which some schools and some teachers will not press too far; and I think that, on the whole, we need not be in the least alarmed at the prospect of our English boys and girls learning too much.

It is to my mind an almost unmixed blessing that education should have begun at last to diffuse itself freely and easily among young English women of all classes. Perhaps it is just as well that the cause of woman suffrage should not have made more rapid progress through the House of Commons. The intermediate time of delay has been well spent. It has been spent in the education of the public to understand how much the movement means in one sense and how little it means in another sense. It means, to my mind, ever so much in consolidation and little or nothing in disruption or dissolution. My excellent friend Mr. Samuel Smith, a member of Parliament, whose earnest philanthropic purposes are well known to many Americans, has, I read, been giving it as his opinion that womanhood suffrage in England must lead to the ruin of the British Empire. That poor British Empire! How has it managed to hold together so long? Every reform threatens to ruin it. How many times have I not heard of its ruin! "These truces with the infidel," says Wamba, the son of Witless, in Scott's "Ivanhoe," "make an old man of me." How so? Because every truce lasted, or rather was appointed to last, a great many years; and yet somehow every truce got quickly broken,—not always by the infidels, be it observed,—and so poor Wamba found that he could count up so many ten years' truces

in his own time as to make him already a patriarch of more extended lifetime than Methuselah himself!

Now, these ruinings of the British Empire make a very, very old man of me. I have always from my earliest days been hearing of their coming on within a specified number of years, and all because of some reform which unthinking, unpatriotic, and "un-English" statesmen were endeavoring to introduce. The reforms have been carried and the empire has gone on rather stronger than before, after each successive change. But, of course, it is only fair to give the prophets their appointed time before we proclaim that their prophecy has failed—and it is in that sense that I begin to think how very, very old I must be, seeing that I can recall the failure, the absolute failure, of such a number of drear vaticinations. We must trust a little to human nature.

The immense change which I have described in the position of women in English political life even within a few short years has not, so far as I have ever heard, made much alteration in the nature of English women. I have not noticed that English women care less about their country than they did before any of them ever sat on a school board or a county council. I have not observed or learned that women have acquired a greater influence over men than they had in the old days. I am inclined to think that the contrary, on the whole, has been the effect of the change. I am inclined to think that the illegitimate influence, the unseen influence, the influence of the petticoat, was stronger over men than the open and legitimate influence of woman in politics now; and I am convinced that for every case in which that illegitimate influence worked for good it worked in many cases for evil. I am less anxious, however, to argue as to the advantages or disadvantages of the change than to call the attention of my American readers to the fact that such a change has taken place, and to induce them to consider its extent and its significance.

There is now no country in the world where women are so openly and avowedly in the political field as England. The United States no doubt come next; but, as I said before, the United States do not show such a growth in the development of woman in politics as is shown by conservative, slow-moving England. When a movement grows in that way, I for one am inclined to think that we may safely accept it as a movement for good. I

was reading lately a poem I had not read for a long time—a poem which had a certain celebrity in my younger years, and which tells us that the poet had lost his faith in humanity—had been disillusionized,—they were easily illusionized and disillusionized in those far-off days,—and there remained to him "in the downcast temple's dust but faith in God alone." Now, I must declare that, even granting due license to poetic mood, I do not quite understand how that state of feeling can explain itself. For how the poet can retain his faith in God and utterly lose his faith in man, whom God may be supposed to have had some good purpose in making, is a problem which passes my understanding. My friend Mr. Samuel Smith has most assuredly not lost his faith in God or in man either. He may be recommended to extend the sphere of his trustfulness and have faith in woman too. The ballot-box will not turn her from that which she is into a totally different creature. Her influence and her advice and her coöperation, which have hitherto worked not badly, on the whole, in the making and keeping of the British Empire, will not utterly become an influence of decay and disruption and dissolution, simply because she adds to her right to sit on the school boards and the county councils, and to speak on what platforms she chooses, the small additional right of voting for or against—for, I hope—the election of my friend Mr. Samuel Smith.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

HOW TO IMPROVE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT.

BY EX-MAYOR HART OF BOSTON, MAYOR DAVIDSON OF BALTIMORE, MAYOR BISHOP OF BUFFALO, AND MAYOR NOONAN OF ST. LOUIS.

IT IS generally felt and often stated that the government of American cities is a failure. At the same time it is conceded that our system of national and State governments is a success. If the government of the country at large and of the separate States be reasonably satisfactory, it is humiliating that we should make a failure of city government. Is it possible that we can govern the whole, and must fail in governing a part? I do not think so. Those who consider all American city government a failure have latterly pointed to Glasgow, Birmingham, and Berlin as models for us to follow. But in our national and State constitutions we have not followed foreign models very closely, and that seems to offer some reason for the belief that in matters of city government we shall do well to propose and execute what is best under our particular circumstances. Mr. Simon Sterne points out that American cities differ very widely, both in theory and in practice, from the cities of other countries. It is to be inferred that the discovery and the administration of the best government for American cities are an American problem, to be solved on the basis of American facts and precedents.

The American theory is that the State creates cities, that cities have no rights not conferred by the State, and that the State may destroy municipal corporations at will. Does it not follow, then, that the lack of efficiency so generally charged against our city governments should be laid in part at the door of the States that created the cities and gave them what power and character they have? If the national government had the same power over States which the latter have over cities, is it not

likely that our States would be in the same predicament in which we find our cities? As a matter of fact, the rights of our States have been fully saved while we have established and maintained a national constitution; but if the towns and cities of America ever had any inherent rights, they have been disregarded or destroyed by the States. Yet it is not, perhaps, a mere dream to think that towns and cities might bear the same relations to a State which the latter bears to the national government.

The larger part of the population of Massachusetts lives in cities. Under our law this majority is deemed incapable of making and changing the fundamental law of cities; but as part of the commonwealth the residents of our cities are supposed to have almost sovereign power. Boston as a city is treated as incapable of self-government; in conjunction with smaller cities and country towns it is thought nearly omnipotent or omniscient, and certainly most wise and independent. In the country at large, and in every State where there are considerable cities, the taxes, the debts, the public works, and the number of public servants of the municipalities greatly exceed those of the States as such. Yet the States have full self-government, and the great municipalities have not. As the self-government of States is a help rather than a hindrance to national self-government, is it not possible and desirable to let our great municipalities enjoy a larger measure of local self-government? We have established and vindicated our national government. Our State governments have never been in danger, and are not now. The constitutional duty of the immediate future, it seems to me, lies in the direction of simplifying, improving, and, perhaps, enlarging municipal government.

The true model and the best precedent for the constitution of an American city, I venture to think, are to be found in our national and State constitutions. They all draw the right line between legislative, judicial, and executive work. This distribution of public power appears to be of fundamental importance. It is probably safe to think that the main reason why so many of our city governments fail to give satisfaction is to be found in the exercise of legislative and executive power by the same municipal officer or body. Some American mayors or other administrative officers still exercise judicial functions, whence the whole class are popularly called magistrates and addressed as "your honor," as if

every mayor was a judge, or ought to be. Aldermen and councilmen, whose duty is plainly legislative, have too often done purely administrative work, at times under State authority, and usually to the detriment of responsible government. To check the exercise of administrative work by aldermen or councilmen, the power and prerogative of mayors have of late been greatly increased; and there is some danger of overloading mayors with such legislative work as an undue share in the laying of taxes or making appropriations. The less a mayor has to do with these, beyond making recommendations and exercising the veto power, the better. Give the mayor full executive power, but keep him out of legislative work. That there can be no liberty where the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, is an axiom quoted by *The Federalist* from Montesquieu.

It is not certain that the mayor should have the absolute power of appointing his subordinates or any other public officers. The power of removal should be vested in the mayor; but the appointing power may properly be limited by giving the board of aldermen the right to confirm or reject. The mayor should have the veto power over all acts of his city council. In turn, he should be required to give reasonable information to the city council on his own acts, as well as on those of the departments under him; and executive appointments may well undergo the ordeal of aldermanic acceptance or rejection in order to prevent mayors from ever thinking that, for the time, they are supreme. The danger that good appointees may be rejected is probably not greater than that hasty or ill-considered appointments will be made. The executive and the legislative branch should be separated; they should not be wholly independent of each other, for the government is to be one, with its duties carefully separated.

As the city council should have the power to order taxes and to make appropriations, beside making ordinances and authorizing public works, its prerogative is necessarily great and needs balancing. The best check to hasty legislation and foolish appropriations is found in a legislature of two branches, each having a negative on the other. If the board of aldermen have the power of passing upon executive appointments, the other branch, usually called the common council, may well have the power and prerogative of originating appropriations. Aldermen should be stripped of all administrative work, if we are to

have a responsible government of cities; but the other chamber should have equal power with the board of aldermen. The system has worked well in our national and State legislatures, and should be adopted in all cities. It is convenient to make the board of aldermen small, and the common council sufficiently numerous to give all classes a representation and spokesmen. All public servants should receive salaries, and all perquisites should be abolished.

A city council of two branches, it seems to me, is absolutely essential. The city council holds the purse-strings, it orders the taxes, and it incurs the debt for which all taxable property is in effect mortgaged. This power is so great that it should not be exercised by one body alone, nor until the matter is at least twice discussed in public by rival branches. Even under a public law limiting taxes and municipal indebtedness, some discretion will rest with the city council. This discretion is less likely to be abused by two rival houses than by one house, especially if the latter be so small as to resemble a board of directors. And city men must learn at their peril that in the matter of dollars and cents their city council is more important than their State legislature.

A clear division of executive departments, I am aware, is extremely difficult, and has not been attained anywhere. The departments in Washington are a jumble, except that the cabinet offices are fairly defined. Below there is less system than the cause of good government requires. City departments are equally confusing, at least in the large cities. Here, then, is a great problem for city councils to solve. This calls for a high order of talent; and that we shall never command unless we dignify city government by giving it some independence. In an emergency only, the national government will interfere with a State; the State may well show the like spirit to its great cities, the homes of wealth and commerce. One of the reasons why men of affairs take so small a part in the government of their own cities is, perhaps, the fact that States can rule cities at will. A remedy is sought, not in self-government, which is nearly extinct, but in appeals to State legislatures. Possibly for the same reason the municipal spirit is so weak in the greatest of all our cities. Yet we ought to learn our first lesson in government and public duty in our own homes. New England still has its priceless town meetings,

where local affairs are settled in the best manner possible. There our best men received their early training. The town of Boston was never incorporated. It exercised prescriptive rights. The cities of America are creatures of the State. When our city taxes are squandered, or we think they are squandered, the legislature of the State, with its country members, is invoked to supply a remedy. Instead of outreasoning and outvoting our opponents in city affairs, as we do in State and national elections, we appeal to men who pay no tax in our cities and could have no intimate acquaintance with the giant problems of city government. No city, I fear, will ever be well governed that does not invite the highest talent, and that fails to hold out the highest inducement to men of light and leading. The problem of city government, I believe, can never be solved except by the city itself and by its home citizens. Instead of relieving men of municipal duties, the latter should be increased. And a great duty well discharged should find its just reward.

A city government should be a continuous body. Mayors should be elected for periods of three or four years. If for three years, aldermen should be elected for four years, one-fourth of their number being elected annually, or one-half biennially. Councilmen should be elected for at least two years, and half the council should be elected annually. The New England system of annually electing an entire city government, it seems to me, is an unfortunate misapplication of town methods. The great Chief-Justice Shaw, who framed our city charter, failed to perceive, possibly, that cities require a representative government, and that towns do not. It was he who made our New England aldermen semi-executive officers and gave us one-year governments.

While I differ with Chief-Justice Shaw and other lawyers, it is quite clear in my mind that we need lawyers of the first order —men like Shaw and Judge Dillon—if we intend to put the constitutions and laws of our great cities upon a firm and lasting basis. I think that the power of our great cities should be increased at the expense of our States. In that work of the future we shall need the best legal talent the country has. We shall need great organizers. We need a *Federalist* for our great American cities. But the best law and the best city constitution cannot take the place of good citizenship. Indeed, the cause here alluded to by a mere layman, who has been twice mayor of Boston,

is altogether hopeless if our leading cities are to be mere markets, and if citizens consider their public duty discharged by the payment of taxes, a vote when the time comes, and habitual grumbling at our own government. Our government is about what we make it. If it be inefficient, we have made it so. If we desire to improve it, we are free to do our best. But no great improvement is possible until the majority, animated by public and worthy motives, takes actual hold and vindicates public opinion duly informed and properly guided. We must do for our cities what the fathers of a century ago did so well for the State and the nation.

THOMAS N. HART,
Ex-Mayor of Boston.

THE essential difficulty in the administration of the affairs of the majority of American cities arises from three principal causes:

First, The apathy and indifference which the majority of the better class of citizens display with regard to taking an active part in municipal government. This disposition can have no other tendency than to gradually delegate the most important functions of a municipality to those whose training and qualifications poorly fit them for the discharge of duties involving large responsibility.

There is no American city where this condition of things has not been a matter of more than ordinary solicitude among the earnest thinkers, who, while recognizing the dangerous tendencies involved in the avoidance of the duties and responsibilities of public office, have yet discovered no remedy. How vastly different is the condition of affairs in some prominent cities of the old world—Berlin, for instance—where a refusal to serve in some of the highest municipal offices is punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both; where the obligation to do so is regarded in such a sacred light that neglect or indifference is at once a mark of dishonor and unworthy citizenship! Were it possible always to secure the services of the ablest and best citizens only, the course of legislation and the general conduct of the affairs of a municipal government would invariably be upon those lines of common-

sense and good judgment in which the very highest degree of success is attained in the private walks of life and business enterprise. Under present conditions the danger is frequently incurred that the wise acts of one council may be frustrated by some subsequent legislation, characterized by cupidity, ignorance, and incapacity.

Second, A most serious drawback is the very narrow limit of the powers of the municipality under the State legislature.

Suppose the case of a private corporation which attempted to do business surrounded by the hampering and restrictive measures which from time to time are suggested to the average country legislator, whose majority power confers upon him the privilege of continually agitating the hayseed clustered around his brain, in efforts to devise new systems which will relieve him, and throw the burden of taxation upon his supposed legitimate prey dwelling in the city. No business can be transacted by our cities without the practical supervision of a State legislature, which rarely realizes that the city has any rights worthy of much respect; and therefore the popular idea of self-government is a mere illusion in the majority of our municipal corporations, for no power exists, in reality, to do any act for the well-being of the citizens, or for the advancement of the material interests of the community, save such as may have previously, in one form or another, received the sanction of the State authorities. I maintain, therefore, that cities of certain grades should hold in many respects the identical relation to the States that the States hold to the general government of the country, and while proper and reasonable restrictions should not be relinquished,—restrictions preventing the disregard of the ordinary principles of law and order,—the city should be invested with discretionary powers for the transaction of its business to much the same extent as is allowed to private corporations.

The fact is, however, quite undeniable that it would be unwise to make such a radical change in the system of municipal government unless the *ensemble* of the local body politic is also changed, and elevated in mental and moral tone, so as to avoid the misuse of the enlarged powers which would thus be acquired. In other words, it is conceded that to small capacity, discrimination, and judgment should only be allowed limited scope for attempts at the exercise of these qualities; and hence the second proposi-

tion is interdependent and conditional upon the first suggestion of the need of a more enlarged interest upon the part of the best citizens in the affairs of government.

Third, The mayor should have absolute power of appointing and removing his subordinates, and should, in that manner, incur substantially the sole responsibility for the manner in which the business of the city is conducted. The ability of a council to interfere, under a power to confirm or reject nominations, when some political favorite is to be served or saved, is an injustice to the mayor charged with the duty of appointment, and often hinders the proper transaction of business; it places in office or retains in position a much lower order of talent than public opinion or the self-respect of the appointing officer would allow, were the power to appoint final and absolute.

There is no reason why our city governments should be considered failures, and they would not be so considered if the majority of the people who live in cities desired their affairs to be conducted on the simple lines of common-sense and prudence which are followed in every branch of private enterprise, and had the energy to enforce their wishes; but the lamentable truth is that such is *not* the case. No man who has had opportunity to observe closely can come to any other conclusion than that the application of strict business principles to city business is calculated to excite derision upon the part of the masses.

This is illustrated in almost the majority of instances where the interest of a city and that of a private corporation come in contact; for in such cases it is invariably charged that those who stand firmly for the protection of the city are manifesting a hostile spirit toward "public improvements," and hence conscientious city officials are subject to ridicule for doing just what a private individual would be censured for not doing.

The application of business principles in requiring employees of our cities to discharge their duty to their employer—the corporation—with fidelity, does not meet with the approval of the whole community, for it is frequently urged as an ameliorating circumstance, in cases of neglect of duty, that the "efficient party service" of the offender is ample cause for mitigating the censure which has been incurred.

The common-sense recognition of the elementary principles of finance is often ignored in a manner which would be considered

unpardonable in private affairs : loans are created, but the important element of a sinking-fund, adequately providing for the hour of redemption, is frequently lost sight of, and it is vastly more popular to experience the temporary enjoyment of a low tax-rate than to make proper provision to avoid the incubus of debt.

In conclusion, the whole question of more efficient city government will be solved when politics are permitted to have no more place in the management of our cities than in individual or corporate enterprise, when the individual citizen realizes the obligation to do his part in holding public office whenever called upon to perform such service, when the powers of self-government are not usurped by the State, and when responsibility is lodged in one chief executive officer whose discretion, ability, character, and standing will be a sufficient guarantee to the community that its best interests will be conserved with absolute fidelity.

ROBERT C. DAVIDSON,
Mayor of Baltimore.

THAT municipal government in American cities is unsatisfactory in results is an established fact, and the city of Buffalo is not an exception to the rule.

Indeed, through the courtesy of the unreliable Eleventh Census our city is made to appear as one of the shining examples of expensive municipal administration. But while that report does great injustice to Buffalo by its inaccurate statements of administrative expenses, yet it is unfortunately true that the results attained are not commensurate with the cost.

Why this condition should long exist is a problem not easy of solution, and the slight success attending the most earnest efforts to correct it is the source of the keenest disappointment to those who are intrusted with executive office. From a careful consideration of the subject, and after the experience of nearly two years as mayor of Buffalo, I am convinced that the fault is not entirely with those who are intrusted with administrative office, but is deeply rooted in our system of municipal control. The fundamental law of our cities is a charter. This charter is granted by legislative enactment, and provides with minutest detail the plan of government, the particular officers, their specific

duties, and the limitation of their powers. I believe that this system is not the one to secure the best results, for the reason that the people of the several cities, who are the ones most interested in the powers to be exercised under these grants or charters, do not have enough voice in the framing of those powers. The municipal government cannot fairly be compared with or modelled strictly after the State or national government, because the needs it must serve and the difficulties it must overcome are so numerous, so diverse, so peculiarly local in character, and so intimately affect the individual and the family. And yet the very difference seems to me to be the strongest reason why cities should be permitted, like the States, to govern themselves, under certain general and well-defined restrictions.

The Legislature of New York is largely composed of men who, elected from what may be termed rural constituencies, are unacquainted with the actual conditions of living in our large cities, and with the great questions that must be considered and settled by the officers of those cities. And this Legislature, at its last session, enacted seven special laws relating to pavements, schoolhouses, parks, etc., in the city of Buffalo, of the necessity for which only six of the one hundred and sixty members could have any personal knowledge ; and that was an unusually small number of such enactments for one session. It is true that these special laws are usually enacted only at the request of the municipality interested ; but it is also true that, in the past, proposed laws of great importance to cities have been delayed for years, and sometimes defeated, after repeated requests for their enactment from the cities concerned, and other laws, relating to the government of some of our larger cities, have been enacted, against the most earnest protest of the people of those cities, to serve personal or partisan ends. It is not unreasonable to believe that better results would be attained by permitting such legislation to be considered and settled by the people of the several cities, or their immediate representatives, rather than by a body of disinterested strangers, ignorant of the particular needs, and not responsible to the people of those cities for the result.

I believe, therefore, that the legislative control over municipal governments should only be to provide general laws for the incorporation of cities and limiting the corporate powers that may be exercised ; and that each city should be permitted to

frame its own charter, subject to those restrictions, and adopt and amend it by vote of its own citizens. I am quite sure that if such power were intrusted to the citizens of Buffalo, its exercise would be uniformly for the benefit of the city. The powers of municipal government should, I believe, be vested in legislative and executive departments; the legislative department to be elective and to consist of two bodies, one elected from and representing different wards or other divisions, and the other composed of a smaller number of members, elected by and representing the whole city. Each body should be a check upon the other. The executive power should be vested in the mayor and, under his supervision, in the heads of different departments. The mayor and such heads of departments as do not require special qualifications should be elective; those heads of departments whose duties require technical knowledge or professional skill and training should be appointed by the mayor. The power of removal should accompany the power of appointment, but should be so guarded as to prevent its abuse. The new charter of the city of Buffalo, enacted by the Legislature of New York at its last session, is, in my judgment, a fair exposition of the proper distribution and limitations of municipal powers. It was framed by a committee of representative citizens, whose selection and deliberations were suggestive of a constitutional convention, and is, I think, a fair example of the practical working of the system I have outlined.

But while the adoption of "home rule" for cities would avoid many of the present difficulties of municipal government, there are many evils that can be cured by the people themselves. The affairs of a city are simply the business of a great corporation, and should be administered as such. The members of the legislative body or bodies constitute the board of directors, and the people, who are the stockholders, should exercise the same care in electing them to secure competent and fit men as they do in choosing the officers and directors of their private corporations. The business methods of the city should be as simple as possible, and the subordinates in the several departments should be chosen with proper regard for their fitness and ability to perform the duties of the positions they are to fill; they should receive such compensation as is reasonable for the services rendered, and their number should be limited by the work to be done. The best re-

sults can be most often secured by infrequent changes; yet retention in office, whatever the grade, either elective or appointive, should be conditioned solely upon honest and successful service.

Our cities increase so rapidly in population, surprising the most sanguine students, that to provide the improvements necessary for the health and convenience of the people requires large expenditures and burdensome taxation, and it is in expenditures for such improvements that the greatest abuses have existed. Let us, however, have home control of our own municipal affairs, unhampered by undue legislative interference or control, and I am confident that the thinking, active, working taxpayers will insist that their public business be conducted solely for the public good, and then the problem of the government of cities will be much nearer solution.

CHARLES F. BISHOP,
Mayor of Buffalo.

THE problem of city government is one worthy of the most careful consideration of our wisest and most conservative people. As far as possible the plan should be in accord with that of our national and State governments. In the nature of things there must be considerable dissimilarity. The bulwark of freedom is the division of power. The safety of the people is the system of checks of one department on another. It is a practical proposition, universally acknowledged and acted upon in business circles, and one which lies at the foundation of bookkeeping, that mistakes can only be avoided where the work of one department is subject to review by another, and where the work of both must correspond, forming thereby a mathematical trial balance.

The framers of our federal constitution recognized this principle and expressed it in that instrument. The division of power into three coördinate, yet distinct and restraining, branches is the acme of governmental wisdom. The division of the legislative into two branches, elected by different means, for different terms, and from different classes of the community, has proven most salutary. Thus the Senate, elected by the legislature (or the whole body of the people of the State), is generally composed of a different class from the House, which is elected by communities

or localities. The former may be said to represent capital; the latter, labor. Each holds a check upon the other, so that, between the extreme views and wishes of the two, legislation is necessarily tinged with conservatism, and hence safety. It may be that the result represents only a compromise, but the medium in the political as well as in the intellectual world is always the safest. The executive is also a check on the legislative branch. It is not superior, because laws may be enacted even without the consent of the executive. The keystone in the arch is, however, to be found in the judicial branch, which neither originates nor enforces the laws, but which construes the acts of both the other branches in the light of constitutional authority, and without which the other two would, possibly, fall into a conflict as to their respective rights and powers. Our States have corresponding branches. Cities, however, at best have only two of the three branches—that is, the executive and legislative. The keystone of the arch is missing. Hence the struggles for supremacy between the other two branches. Hence the unseemly and oftentimes injurious conflicts between the two, always the result of a grasping for more power by the one or the other, or a trenching of one branch upon the prerogatives of the other. There is no judiciary to curb and restrain and define the powers and the duties of each to the other. The courts of the State must needs, therefore, be appealed to in such cases, and this is almost always resented as the introduction of a foreign element into the controversy.

The government of St. Louis is as nearly perfect as that of any city in the United States, and yet, while it is modelled upon the theory and plan of our federal and State governments, and has the executive and legislative branches, with the veto power in the former, and the division of the latter into a higher, select, and smaller body, and a lower, larger, and more essentially representative body, and while the concurrence of both branches of the legislative and that of the executive are necessary to the enacting of any law, except that the legislative can overrule the executive veto by the necessary vote, still the judicial branch is wanting, and the result is that from time to time the other two branches have encroached upon the powers or prerogatives of each other, or, in attempting to do so, have created "deadlocks," which necessarily impair the efficiency of the public service. In St.

Louis there are further checks for the preservation of the rights of the people, which also render frauds and dishonesty in public office almost impossible without being speedily detected. Thus the comptroller is the fiscal officer, and his approval is necessary to all expenditures. The auditor sees that no money is spent unless there has been an appropriation for the purpose. The treasurer cannot pay out a cent unless ordered by both the comptroller and auditor. These are elected officers, heavily bonded and directly responsible to the people. No financial difficulties or shortages can occur without the connivance of all three. In addition, there is another check upon the reckless or extravagant appropriation or expenditure of public money for street purposes, in the fact that the legislative branch cannot pass an ordinance for such purposes unless it is recommended by the board of public improvements, which is composed of five members appointed by the mayor, and a president who is elected by a direct vote of the people.

The charter of this city was adopted in pursuance of a constitutional grant of the power given to it to have a board of fifteen freeholders propose a charter to the people of the city for their adoption, which should, when adopted, be the organic law of the city. The instrument was most carefully prepared by eminent citizens, many of them of national reputation, and while it is necessarily defective in respect to the absence of the judicial branch, it is nevertheless confidently believed to be the best city charter in the land. In fact, it has in fifteen years' experience proved so satisfactory that it has been embodied almost literally in the statutes of this State as the law for the government of all cities having a population of over 100,000 inhabitants, and its principal features have been adopted for the government of all cities, towns, and villages, however small.

The chief difficulty that has so far been experienced is in the requirement that all appointments of the executive shall be confirmed by the council (or upper branch of the legislative power). It has occurred that the members of the council have attempted to use the confirming power to coerce the discretion or prerogative of the executive as to whom he shall appoint, by refusing to confirm his nominee because they thought some one else ought to be appointed. This has caused temporary inconvenience, annoyance, and injury to the public service; but such unlawful assump-

tion of authority, such flagrant abuse of the confirming power, has happily been of rare occurrence, and has always been rebuked by the people at the next election, and the persons so abusing their trust have been promptly relegated to private life.

All governments necessarily curtail the natural rights of man. The protection they afford to life and property compensates fully for the deprivation, impairment, or curtailment of such natural rights. Urban communities need more government and sterner rule than country districts. The former need a head, who is always on duty, with full power to preserve the peace and protect the weak. The latter are sufficiently protected by the character of the people, the want of attraction to the lawless classes, and the general laws of the State to be enforced by the courts. Hence the executive of a city is a peace officer of the community. The legislative branch cannot always be in session. So its powers should be limited to prescribing laws for the punishment of offenders against the peace, health, morality, and good government of the body corporate. As the executive is always on duty and generally busy, his powers should be large and liberally construed, and he should be in fact, as well as in name, the chief officer of the municipality. The business of any other branch should be to aid him, support him, and advise with him, and it should be left to the courts or the people to punish him for excesses or abuses of authority. To enable him properly and harmoniously to carry out the principles of local rule, he should be allowed to select his staff of assistants. His choice should only be restrained or overruled where he has plainly violated the American idea of honesty, fidelity, and fitness in selecting his aids.

As governments are necessary for protection, and as taxes can only be justified on the theory of protection, so the plan of a city government should be to give to the person specially charged with the duty of protecting the citizens all needed powers, while the expenditure of the people's money, which should be done with deliberation, ought to be left to the legislative, or, properly, the business, portion of the government.

We frequently hear that politics should have no place in municipal affairs. Politics, properly understood, means only the science of government—the regulation and government of the State, the preservation of its safety, peace, and prosperity, the protection of its citizens in their rights, with the preservation and improvement

of their morals. If these are objects worthy of national interest, why are they not equally desirable of attainment and observance in local matters? To achieve them is the purpose of all governments, national, State, and local. For such purposes alone taxes are levied. How to accomplish such beneficial results is a question of as much concern, proportionately, in local matters as it is in national. The protection of the people, and the expenditure of the people's money to secure that protection, are the sole object and purpose of both. If the wisdom of our forefathers and the experience of over a century have satisfied us that these ends can only be attained by the fundamental doctrine of a division of powers in the nation, why does not the same hold good in municipal governments? In St. Louis it has been tried and it is confidently believed that with a very few modifications, which experience and time will accomplish, the problem of the government of cities has been solved in its present charter.

EDWARD A. NOONAN,
Mayor of St. Louis.

WHAT AMERICANS CAN DO FOR RUSSIA.

BY SERGIUS STEPNIAK.

I WANT to tell you a story—the story of a dream, which I may call the dream of my life. It was nine years ago, in Italy, that it took hold of me, and since then my life has been a chase after this dream.

I wrote several books, and I had the rare good fortune to see some trace of their influence upon the views of the thoughtful men of our time. But had these books marked an epoch in literature, I should not care for it half so much as for one step toward the realization of my dream. When I speak of it, people smile and tell me that "it is only a dream." May be. Sometimes I think so myself. But that does not diminish my desire to gain converts to it. All great things have had an element of dream behind them. The world is—I will not say for dreamers, but—for those to whom the dreamers have given it. There is a strange power in a dream which nothing else can impart. A dream is an idea impersonated, poetized, throbbing with life and enthusiasm. It engrosses the whole of a man—mind, heart, and soul; it stirs up his emotional nature and concentrates all his faculties upon one single object. That is what I have experienced, and wish others to experience too.

In telling my story I shall be personal sometimes, and I do not know whether I should apologize for this. I have found that personal things interest people most, and I wish some one to be interested in, possibly to take some hints from, these pages.

But what is this dream of mine?

This dream is to see one day a new crusade started in the West against the great sinner of the East, the Russian Tzardom; to see an army spring into existence—not a host, but a well-selected army like that of Gideon—composed of the best men of all free nations, with unlimited means at their command, making common

cause with the Russian patriots, fighting side by side with them, each with their appropriate weapons, until that nightmare of modern times, the Russian autocracy, is conquered, and compelled to accept the supremacy of the triumphant democracy.

This is truly a "dream," if not a chimera! the reader will say.

I warned him that so it is. But all dreams, even those which are apparently most incoherent and absurd, have their origin in the realities of life. Mine is no exception, and springs from the natural and, for a Russian, legitimate desire to find some compensation for the special difficulties which surround our struggle for freedom.

Of greater material difficulties I will not speak. Being the last to rebel, we have to face a government which has taken advantage of all the wonders of modern technical invention, as well as of the improvement in the material part of culture, and is far better equipped for fight and resistance than any previous tyranny.

I will not dwell upon the effect of the general character of our country—enormous distances, predominance of agricultural population, smallness of towns, and the like. All this is self-evident.

I prefer to speak here about a circumstance of apparently small importance, but in reality of great moment. In our hard struggle, the soothing, inspiring, and invigorating dream element has been cruelly spoiled for us by fate, or at least awarded with peculiar miserliness.

The English, who were the first to rebel against absolutism and win political freedom, were in this respect the most favored people in the world. Theirs was a political revolution carried on upon a religious basis. They were firmly persuaded that they were fighting for men's happiness, both in this world and in the future What a scope for noble and exalted dreams in those good Roundheads! Certainly they were the best-cared-for children in the revolutionary family, as the first-born are with the chosen people of Israel.

The French, who followed suit a century later, had their inheritance of dreamland diminished by half. Still, they had no reason to complain, for their share was large enough. Political freedom—Liberty—was for them but a third sister of two other goddesses, Equality and Fraternity. What more would the world need to become an earthly paradise if it had all these three?

But there is no way of dreaming about things which have already become a part of reality. Dreams thrive in the twilight of glimmering hope. The crude prosaic light of day takes off their evanescent glory. The nineteenth century holds fast to political rights and representative government, improving and developing them further, but no longer idealizes them.

Dreams have not forsaken this generation, which, on the contrary, is perhaps the most given to dreams, and therefore the most fervid and impetuous, that history records. But they have fled from modern council chambers as the beautiful native birds of America have fled from the bustle and noise of towns to the woods of the far West. Dreams are hovering now over the new land which the keen-sighted men of our time have already discerned on the horizon—the land of the future coöperative civilization, the promised land of the present competitive, pugnacious, man-a-wolf-to-man civilization.

But those glorious dreams, which are like beacons lighting the high road of progress for advanced nations, were for us Russians like will-o'-the-wisps, which led us astray from the path marked out for us by inexorable history, and caused—for a time at least—deplorable disunions and still more deplorable losses. A whole generation—the best that has ever been born to Russia—was sacrificed before we learned the simple truth that the cart must not be put before the horse, or, in other words, that the social order cannot be changed before people have the means to change it. No country had to pay so dearly for such an elementary doctrine.

We learned at last to postpone our personal inclinations to the needs of the country, and, leaving the future to the future, we accepted for the present the great and modest mission which history has laid upon our generation—the political enfranchisement of the country, the obtaining for Russia of those elementary guarantees of civil freedom and constitutional government which all the nations of Europe already possess.

What can be less romantic and dreamy at the time we live in? Yet we fought, and I dare say fought valiantly, finding our inspiration in love to our country and in faith in the Russian people.

It was a fierce, terribly unequal struggle, which, with the reader's permission, I can compare only to that of the Spartans of Leonidas against the hordes of Xerxes. The whole power of a

mighty empire was arraigned against the small body of revolutionists, who were able to make face against such overwhelming power only thanks to their boundless self-sacrifice and devotion. They struggled as long as they had breath, and they fell almost to a man. As I pass in memory all these friends and companions of mine, I find that two-thirds of them are already dead, some upon the scaffold, some others in prison; the remaining third pining away in the Siberian mines or in the dungeons, waiting for death to release them; only a handful, seven or eight, having escaped the common doom and being now in the lands of the free—one after five, another after ten, the third after fifteen years of prison and sufferings. I think I am the only one who escaped almost scathless—a privilege that needs apology.

I shall be permitted, I hope, without infringing the rules of modesty, to say that this is due, not to my lagging behind, but to my good luck and also to my dream.

In Russia, when a revolutionist gets into trouble with the police, the usual expedient is to change identity and settle in a new place. But after a while this expedient no longer suffices. Then the man will sometimes get smuggled across the frontier and have an "airing" abroad.

I left Russia and returned in this way three times. In 1882 I was taking my "airing" in Italy, and was in correspondence with my St. Petersburg friends about my return to Russia, which I had every reason to believe would be my last. It was the epoch when absolutism and revolution, both having sustained severe blows, were straining their forces in the attempt at mutual destruction. It was impossible to survive long in such a fierce struggle, and one does not come from so far for a short visit.

But whilst the preparations for my return were going on, something unexpected occurred: I wrote a little book—my "Underground Russia," which appeared originally in Italian. From the very outset it was evident that this little volume had made what is called a hit—had won a good prize in the literary lottery. Hitherto our publications were addressed to a special public—to our revolutionary congregation, I should say. This was the first time that the Russian revolution addressed the world at large, and the question dawned upon me whether it would not be the right thing to do to improve the opportunity.

We were struggling for freedom, which all the civilized na-

tions already enjoy. It was right that the free nations should extend a friendly hand to us: were we not following in the way they have tempted us into by their example? Besides, does not the Russian autocrat receive from foreign countries all assistance, both material and moral, in maintaining tyranny? Some of the foreign governments, indeed, go so far as to actually help him in hunting down his rebellious subjects. If the Tzar is helped so energetically by the selfish and reactionary elements of civilization, it is only fair that we should get from the liberty-loving people that support which they can reasonably give.

The thing was right and just, and seemed to me very easily attainable. If the world so awfully misjudged us, it was due entirely to the fact that free scope was allowed to our enemies in calumniating us. We had only to tell the truth, and nothing but truth, about our party and our people, and all would be changed.

It was then that the dream I have mentioned took hold of me.

To conquer the world for the Russian revolution; to throw upon the scales the huge weight of the public opinion of civilized nations; to bring to those whose struggle is so hard that unexpected help; to find without a lever to move the minds of the Russians themselves within—this was the dream which glistened before me.

The opportunity was unique.

Was it worth while to withdraw from the ranks of the combatants one active member and make a writer of him?

I answered the question in the affirmative, and remained abroad permanently.

In my moments of despondency, which others may call moments of lucidity, whilst thinking of the little which I have done, I question the wisdom of my resolution. But I have never repented of it. All my companions whose memory I cherish would in my place have decided it in the same way.

I have not conquered the world for the Russian revolution. I hardly need say that. What I have succeeded in doing was to make in it a small place for myself. But this was not, indeed, the object of my endeavors. When I think of my present life, of the undisturbed pleasure of my literary pursuits, and of the friendship of so many good, generous men and women, which alone

would suffice to exalt and brighten a man's existence, and when I compare my life with the fate of those with whom I expected to share everything,—well, I cannot help feeling something very different from pleasure.

But whilst I was hammering away at my little anvil with an energy due in great part to my dream, which was always receding, sometimes growing dim, but never disappearing from my horizon, two events of really world-wide importance occurred to revive my hopes and render some attempts at their realization possible.

These two events were, first, the great success of Russian novelists, and, second, the appearance of Mr. George Kennan's articles.

It is not by hatred to the Russian autocracy, but by sympathy with the Russian people, that foreigners have been moved to side with the cause of Russian freedom. There are many governments in Asia and Africa which are even worse than the Russian. Yet who cares about that? If people feel differently with regard to Russia, it is because Russia has ceased to be a mere geographical expression for them. They have got to know something of the Russians as living men and women, and that is the only reason why they can assimilate themselves with the Russians and sympathize with them.

Now, there is certainly nothing which can give such an insight into Russian life and character as the work of our great novelists. They do not describe—they give the living life such as it is; and the crowd of Russian men and women whom they present in spirit, with the completeness and reality of which great artists alone have the secret, have familiarized the world with Russia more than any amount of study or travelling could do. Turgueneff, Tolstoï, Dostoëvsky, have prepared the ground for all that is sympathetic with Russia of the Russians, as distinguished from official Russia.

Mr. George Kennan deals directly with the Russian political question, taking it also from its humane side. It is by presenting the living men and women who are the "victims" of Russian despotism, by showing human tears which are shed and blood which flows, that he called forth throughout all the world an outcry against Russian tyranny.

Of the historical importance of his work I need not speak. From the time of the publication of his articles the Russian

question has held a conspicuous and peculiar place in the thoughts and feelings of modern humanity.

But the Russian question has for the world more than a sentimental interest. The destinies of a state numbering over a hundred and ten million inhabitants must necessarily affect, for good or for evil, the destinies of its neighbors. The fate of Europe will be changed if autocracy is abolished in Russia. Independently of temporary excitement about her, Russia will always attract much attention on the part of those who take interest in the general progress of humanity. She is the youngest in the family of civilized nations, but she has already shown what potentialities are hidden within her. Russia is a country with a great future, and the romance and poetry of great expectations are adding powerfully to the attraction which she exercises.

The total amount of intelligent interest and sympathy which the Russian cause has excited in the world at large is undoubtedly very great ; and, on the whole, it will undoubtedly increase as Russia becomes better known, as her interior convulsions become more apparent, and as the rapid progress of nations all the world over makes the contrast between Russian régime and theirs more shocking.

The question is how to utilize that powerful current of thoughts and emotions to the best advantage of the country which has excited them.

My trip through the States, however short, was sufficient to convince me that there are thousands and thousands of Americans who would wish for nothing better. But how to do it—that is the point.

Ours is a domestic feud. There is no foreign power to uphold tyranny in Russia, as was the case with Italy, Greece, and Hungary. This puts direct assistance on the part of sympathetic foreigners entirely out of the question. The Russians must fight their own battle as best they can. Even diplomatic interference, which has been suggested by some of our friends, seems to me not advisable, except in the Jewish question, which is a peculiar one, the position of Jews in Russia being strictly analogous to that of the Bulgarians and other Christian populations under the Turkish yoke. With regard to the Russian question in general, it is to public opinion pure and simple, and nothing but public opinion, that we appeal. No American will deny our right to ask

for such support, or his countrymen's right to give it to us. But there are very few who will not doubt in their hearts whether such support is worth much for the Russian.

During my journey through the States I had to speak upon this subject with several hundreds of people, and I remember only one man—it was Colonel Robert Ingersoll—who stopped me at the beginning of my explanations and himself told me all the arguments I had in store for proving the great value of foreign agitation. Others, who seemed to admit this on general grounds, were still curious to hear how the thing can be applied to Russia in particular.

But in nine cases out of ten we had to go through regular debates, which were remarkably uniform. The inquirer started, as a rule, from the supposition that the object of the agitation is to reach the Tzar and to give him correct information about his country. This was certainly very *naïve*, and, for a Russian, an amusing way of regarding our efforts. But if my American friends should be offended by my remark, I may console them by saying that the English were just as bad.

It was very natural in both cases. In America, as well as in England, the government is a sort of registering office shaping into laws what public opinion bids. But in Russia we have still to get such a government. At present we have one that knowingly and deliberately resists native public opinion, taking advantage of the fact that material force is still in its hands. It may happen, and it has happened several times, that foreign disapprobation has induced the Russian government to take steps which native public opinion could have never enforced: this is the usual way with despots. But it would be absurd to depend upon such influence. For us, foreign agitation has a value of its own. It is a new weapon in the struggle. Russia, as a state, depends in many ways upon the support of foreign countries. By creating abroad a stream of public feeling hostile to the present government in Russia, we weaken its position as much as by withdrawing a part of its support at home. This is perfectly well understood by the present rulers of Russia. Although always short of cash, the Russian Government spares no expense to keep foreign public opinion on its side. A number of official papers (such as *Le Nord* and *Le Gaulois*) are maintained; all the papers that can be corrupted

are corrupted. The London *Times* and *Daily Telegraph* have informed their readers that the sum of about half a million dollars was assigned in 1890 for this laudable purpose. What better proof could there be of the value of foreign public opinion ?

Besides, the great increase of the cosmopolitan or international element in the intellectual life of the educated people of modern times, especially in Russia, makes foreign agitation a powerful, though indirect, means to stir up public opinion within Russia herself.

I remember that whenever I mentioned this point to Americans they invariably expressed great surprise. It was wonderful enough that the Russians should be affected by what distant foreigners think and say about them, but it seemed to them still more surprising that Russians should know so much about it, for they guessed that papers containing anything unfavorable to the Russian government would hardly be allowed to have free circulation in the empire of the Tzar.

I had to explain that, besides the usual open system of spreading literature which Americans know, there is a system of clandestine circulation unknown to them, but working very well in Russia. Anything that is of great interest to the public is sure to be smuggled, one way or another, in a limited number of copies into Russia. Here the thing is immediately translated into Russian and lithographed or hectographed in hundreds of copies, each copy having hundreds of readers. They are not thrown away or stored up in libraries : they are too precious for the one and too dangerous for the other. They pass from hand to hand until they are worn to rags, and those of their temporary owners who unite sociability with courage will privately assemble their friends in parties of ten, fifteen, or more, and read the interesting thing aloud to them. No more pleasant and "high-class" entertainment can be given in Russia. No work has been so strictly tabooed by the Russian censorship as Mr. George Kennan's articles in *The Century*, and nevertheless there is hardly a man or woman interested in politics who has not read them. The same may be said of some other publications.

News of importance is transmitted from mouth to mouth, and spreads rapidly all over the country. In the summer of 1890 Mr. Smith, a Gladstonian, asked a question in Parliament about the Siberian atrocities. Two months later I received from a friend

living in a small provincial town in the heart of Russia a letter asking me whether it was true that *Mr. Gladstone* asked a question in Parliament upon these atrocities. The news had reached the province quickly enough, though becoming a little magnified by transmission.

Sometimes news of peculiar piquancy is spread openly through the papers published under the censorship, by means of virulent and abusive articles purporting to denounce the thing in question. The public, being used to this, leaves the husk and takes the kernel.

It cannot be expected that anything written by foreigners or for foreigners should tell to the bulk of Russians anything which they did not know already from their own experience or observation. But in all cases what stirs up the Russians so deeply is the fact that there has been interest taken and sympathy expressed for their cause among those nations which the Russians are wont to consider their elders in civilization and freedom. Our people respect to a fault foreign public opinion. Foreign agitation becomes, therefore, to some extent, a substitute for a broader agitation upon the Russian soil, which is impossible under our present political conditions. It is a real power, a source of actual help in our struggle for freedom.

But how can it be carried out ? There are many means of influencing and expressing public opinion in free countries—the press, public meetings and demonstrations, protests, and petitions. All these have been employed in the interest of the Russian cause, and all are good in their way. I do not want to impose my views upon any one. If I have some bias against petitioning, it is simply on account of the petitioners themselves. It seems to me a pity that so many good, refined, high-minded men and women should address in deferential terms a man who has connived at and ordered the flogging of women, and other outrages which ought to have excluded him from the companionship of decent people.

Public demonstrations and meetings, if of imposing character, are very valuable in certain exceptional circumstances, and they have the advantage of being noticed, like all public events, in the Russian press—it matters little with what comments.

But our real battering-ram is undoubtedly the press, which is the least obtrusive, the most unimpeachable, and at the same time

the most effective of the weapons we have at our disposal—the daily press in particular, which is the greatest power of modern times.

We have to deal with facts. The influence of our work depends wholly upon the amount of authentic information upon Russian things we put in circulation. Blame receives its poignancy, and sympathy its full effect, when known to be based not upon vague generalities, but upon concrete, authentic, and numerous facts, which have been exposed in all details and open to the test of controversial examination. All this we get by means of the daily press, which has, moreover, the inestimable advantage of telling things whilst they are fresh and recent, and not after they have been covered with the rust of time.

We do not want to flood the daily press with Russian affairs; this would be bad policy, even if it were in our power to inflict such an inundation upon the reading public. The amount of attention and room given to Russian affairs by the American and English press seems to us amply sufficient. It is the quality of the information that must be improved—its importance and authenticity.

Now, as the only means of getting into permanent communication with modern journalism is to enter into its confraternity, the idea of a newspaper devoted to the Russian cause abroad came naturally to the front.

Such a paper was actually started in England in June, 1890, under the auspices of the English Friends of Russian Freedom, a society headed by a committee of thirty-seven members, including nine members of Parliament, ministers of all denominations, and some of the most influential men and women in England.

Dr. R. Spence Watson, Bensham Grove, Gateshead on Tyne, the chairman of the Liberal Association of Great Britain, is the founder and president of this society; Edward R. Pease (Hyde Park Mansions, London) is its secretary.

The paper is *Free Russia*, published simultaneously in London and New York (51 *Tribune* Building).

In April last a society similar to the English one was founded in Boston on the initiative of Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Colonel T. W. Higginson, Samuel Clemens (Mark Twain), and William Lloyd Garrison. In a few weeks it received the adhesion of a number of persons, among whom were men of such eminence as

John G. Whittier, James Russell Lowell, Phillips Brooks, F. D. Huntington, Lyman Abbott, and many others, without speaking of Mr. George Kennan, who was one of the first to join the society and who has promised his full and hearty support. Mr. Francis Garrison, of Boston (4 Park Street), is its treasurer ; Mr. Spring is its secretary.

From the reception which the movement met with in New York and other important cities, it is easy to foresee that the new society promises to become within a short time a national one, with scores of branches in all the principal cities of the States.

It is quite possible that at the next anniversary of the London society a new society of the same nature may be organized in Germany, then in Austria, Italy, and—at the first clearing of the political horizon from the mist of Russian alliance—in France.

This course is the right one, and the beginning is excellent. The existence of such a paper and of such a league of eminent men, many of whom are known and respected in Russia, will constitute an impressive and permanent demonstration in favor of Russia's freedom. But I wish some one would look beyond the immediate issue, and see, behind the paper, the vast movement of which it must be the interpreter.

A special paper devoted to Russian interests can never command more than a few thousand subscribers. Its influence will be certainly much greater than the mere number of its subscribers may suggest. But to become a real power in the struggle, to become a source from which papers commanding millions of readers will draw their information, this paper must have means exceeding those it can get by ordinary subscription. We can avail ourselves now only of information obtained gratuitously, or almost gratuitously. But there is much more which could be taken advantage of. Every press man knows what a well-organized bureau of correspondents can do.

The society which stands behind the paper is, therefore, more important than the paper. The paper is the tool, a pick-axe, very well adapted for excavating the truth, but the society is the hand holding this tool, and the amount of useful work depends upon the strength of the hand.

There is a law of equivalents and of conservation of energy in social life, as well as in mechanics. The light which has been thrown upon Russia's inner conditions has generated sympathy.

This sympathy can be again converted into light, which will be the exact equivalent of the material means spent upon it.

Hitherto we have been able to throw into the outer darkness of the Russian empire a few burning torches, so to speak, which have lit up a certain piece of ground, showing the monsters hidden there. This has not been entirely useless. But we could do much more. In modern warfare artificial lights have been used to light up the enemy's camps by night, the light from a powerful source being thrown to a distance by means of big reflectors. It seems to me that the American and English friends of Russian freedom can do, if they choose, something analogous with regard to the Russian autocracy. By combining our efforts we could break the darkness in which its deeds are wrapped, and keep upon it permanently the glowing, all-pervading light of publicity.

Will the Americans or the English care to do this?

I do not know. I only know that there is a way to effectively help the Russians, and I have shown it.

Many times I have heard Americans say that they consider it a sacred duty of the free nations to help those who are still struggling for their freedom. I am certainly the last man to contradict such a doctrine. But there are duties so lofty that their fulfilment can be hoped for, but never claimed.

We are prepared for everything. If there is no hope of advancing the cause of freedom in Russia otherwise than through rivers of blood and over the corpses of Russia's most devoted children, we will accept this too. But looking upon the matter as objectively as I possibly can, it seems to me that there is no foundation for so gloomy a view.

There is no cause involving any humanitarian interest which has not thriven in our generous age, and the cause of Russia is the cause of one hundred and ten millions of men, who all suffer in their different ways—peasants and Jews, educated people and ignorant. No cause is greater and more deeply ingrained in the thought and feeling of modern humanity.

The idea of the brotherhood of nations is no longer a dream of a few idealists. It is one of the realities of modern life and the foundation of our hopes. Nations are united much more closely nowadays than they were fifty, or even twenty-five, years ago. Everywhere I have happened to pass I have met numbers of American men and women to whom the sufferings of Siberian

exiles and prisoners, and the horrors of which they constantly hear from distant Russia, have been the source of mental pain as deep and real as if caused by something happening at their doors. There are thousands who feel thus in the towns and cities of the States. They could start a movement which, by its usefulness, magnitude, and character, would be the glory of the enlightened century which renders it possible. They would certainly start such a movement *if only they could believe* that their efforts would be, not a waste of energy, not mere sentimental outpourings, but a real work for Russian enfranchisement, a real means of strengthening the party of freedom and weakening the party of despotism.

This seems to me the gist of the question. There is no limit to the extensions of our work and of the good that can be done if people only come to believe in it.

Now, this belief can be imparted if there are a few men or women who will study the matter carefully, with minds unprejudiced by its apparent unwontedness, and themselves come to believe in a plan which, for the sake of practical people, I will still call a dream.

S. STEPNIAK.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE DEBTS.

BY THE HON. ROBERT P. PORTER, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE ELEVENTH CENSUS.

IT HAS cost nearly a million dollars thus far to collect the statistics of mortgage indebtedness of individuals and private corporations throughout the United States. That seems like a large sum of money, but it will take, as I informed the committees of both houses of Congress, when the matter was up for consideration, at least another half-million dollars to finish the work.

Did Congress act wisely in appropriating a million dollars to carry on this investigation, especially when the committees were informed at the time that certainly half a million more, and possibly another million, would be required for the investigation? It was not a hesitating act. Both parties voted for it. In the Senate, I believe, but four votes were cast against the bill, and in the House of Representatives not over twenty-five negative votes were recorded. It was a novel, not to say a bold, step in statistical inquiry. Old statisticians shook their heads, and said the obstacles in the way of such an investigation were too great to overcome. All over the country could be heard murmurings of discontent and declarations that the people of the United States would never submit to such an inquisitorial inquiry pertaining to their private affairs. Partisan newspapers made this investigation, forced upon the Census Office, in spite of repeated protests, by an almost unanimous vote in both houses, an excuse for malicious attacks upon the whole census, and called upon the people to resist the enumerators, if necessary, with force.

Meantime the Superintendent of Census was sorely perplexed. This novel inquiry had been ordered on the very eve of sending out the population schedules. Those schedules were complete, and the public printer was ready to start the printing of 25,000,000,

the probable number required. No time could be lost. To put questions in the population schedule asking every individual in the United States the amount of the mortgage on his farm or home, the motive for contracting the debt, and the value of his property, would have swamped the constitutional enumeration of the people. The amount of irritation which would have been aroused, had this course been adopted, cannot be estimated. The enumeration of the people would have been endangered, and for no purpose, because, in the very nature of things, the enumerators would have failed in half the cases to obtain the desired information about mortgages.

The accepted theory of the census is that the enumerators see personally about one in every seven of the inhabitants. Already the population schedule of the census was bowed down with the burden of a double yoke. There were twice as many questions as should have been propounded before those relating to mortgages were added. These questions, however, were made as easy as possible by throwing out all reference to the amount of indebtedness, interest, value of property, etc., and confining them to a simple inquiry as to whether the farm or home was owned or rented, and, if owned, whether free from debt or encumbered by a mortgage. If unable to ascertain whether a home was mortgaged or not, the enumerator was instructed to give the full name and address of the owner, and in subsequent correspondence the Census Office assumed that the property was mortgaged until otherwise informed. This solution proved a practical one, and has formed the basis of one of the most valuable and interesting investigations ever undertaken by any government.

While the addition of these and other questions, such as those relating to the veterans of the late war, increased the cost and added to the difficulties of the constitutional enumeration, and while my individual voice will always be raised against thus overloading the population schedule with special inquiries, I am satisfied that, owing to the high character of the supervisors and the faithfulness and intelligence of the vast body of enumerators, the enumeration of the people did not suffer to any serious extent. At the same time, Congress should in future legislation simplify the population schedule, and relegate all questions relating to special inquiries to other schedules,

to be subsequently filled out by special agents or by enumerators employed by the day.

And now a word as to the cost, magnitude, and results of this stupendous inquiry into individual indebtedness and the debt of private corporations throughout the United States. One million and a half dollars seems a great deal of money, but when the field of inquiry is only limited by the boundary of this vast domain of ours ; when every one of the nine million mortgages placed on record during the ten years ended December 31, 1889, has to be examined and transcribed to slips ; when circular requests have to be addressed and mailed, numbering three millions and a half ; when all raw material has to be digested in the Census Office and arranged for the volumes,—when, as I say, this is all considered, a million and a half dollars is not such an imposing sum of money.

Nor can the benefits of this expenditure be gauged by the statistical or scientific test alone. Though at first doubtful as to the expediency of the investigation, fearful that it would endanger the enumeration, and opposed to adding it to a census overloaded with special inquiries, the results have compelled me to regard the work of the farms, homes, and mortgages division of the Census Office as of more direct and immediate value to the country than all the rest of the census put together. A successful business man must keep an eye alike on the profit and the loss side of his ledger. He must be acquainted with what goes out as well as with what comes in. No nation is so prosperous that it can afford to ignore its debts, whether national, State, municipal, corporate, or individual. The first step towards paying a debt is to ascertain its exact amount. The next step is to ascertain the productive powers of the man or nation.

As a student of public debts, I find that in the United States we have our debt-creating as well as our debt-paying periods. Without discussing the national debt, which was largely a war debt, the history of State, county, municipal, and even township debts in the United States shows that we have repeatedly had almost crazes of going into debt ; and they have been followed by periods of retrenchment and of debt-paying. There are people now living who will recall the enormous sums of money voted by States for all sorts of internal improvements far in advance of the requirements of population, beginning in 1830 and continuing for seven years—a most extraordinary finan-

cial period. Under these State debts, which seemed to reach their culminating point in 1842, the strongest States of the Union staggered, and some of the most solvent of our Northern States were on the verge of bankruptcy. Another attack of debt-creating fever came after the war, and extended to counties in the Western States and municipalities in the East. Counties voted money for railroads, and cities for any kind of improvements, with a prodigality somewhat in proportion to the ease with which the money was at first obtained. With the crash of 1873 came the accounting time, and a period of debt adjusting and paying. The census of 1890 will show a great reduction in the per capita of public debt and a sound financial condition of State and local finance throughout the country.

STATEMENT SHOWING THE TOTAL AND PER-CAPITA INDEBTEDNESS OF THE UNITED STATES, LESS SINKING-FUNDS, FOR 1870, 1880, and 1890.

Character of debt.	Amount of debt less sinking-funds.			Per-capita debt less sinking-funds.		
	1870.	1880.	1890.	1870.	1880.	1890.
Totals	$3,275,239,131	$3,045,796,010	$2,019.735,796	$84.94	$60.73	$32.25
United States (national)	2,406,562,373	1,922,517,364	891,960,104	62.41	38.33	14.24
States, Territories, and District of Columbia	352,866,698	297,244,094	228,997,385	9.15	5.93	3 66
Counties	187,565,540	124,105.027	141,950,845	4.86	2.47	2.27
Municipalities	271,119,668	684,348,843	b 719.068,656	7.03	13.64	11.48
School Districts	57,124,852	17,580,682	c 37,758,806	1.48	.35	.60

b. Subject to revision, 59 small places delinquent.
c. Idaho not included.

Especially note the decline in State debts in the above exhibit. In round figures, it may be said the per-capita State debt has gone from nine dollars in 1870 to six dollars in 1880, and finally to three dollars at the present time. Municipal indebtedness seems to have reached its highest point in 1880, and this is in keeping with the known facts. Between 1870 and 1877 municipalities were seized with a debt-creating fever the like of which had never been observed in this country before or since. The result was that the per-capita debt doubled between 1870 and 1880. From $271,000,000 to $684,000,000 is a tremendous jump, and this during a decade in which the city population only increased from 8,071,875 to 11,318,547. During the last decade, which has been

one of municipal debt-paying and retrenchment, the increase was only from $684,000,000 to $719,000,000, while the city population went from 11,318,547 to 18,235,670. The per-capita debt has decreased. The crisis in county debt-creating was reached, as the above table shows, in 1870. The per-capita county debt dropped from $4.86 in 1870 to $2.47 in 1880, and a slight decrease is noted again in 1890.

One of the ablest articles ever written on the subject of public debt was by Benjamin R. Curtis, published in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for January, 1844. This eminent jurist rightly contended, in commenting on the then existing State debt, that great injustice must be done to the people of this country if the general state of men's minds and of financial affairs is left out of view in considering the subject of their indebtedness. "They have been rash," he said, "but it was at a time when rashness was epidemic; they have been improvident, but it was when prudence was generally considered little better than narrow-minded timidity; their fault may have been very great, but it was very general, and it was a fault of which the creditor largely partook with the debtor. It was rash and improvident in them to borrow, but it was rash and improvident in others to lend, for in those cases the lenders had almost as good means of knowing the grounds of credit as the borrowers had."

What is true of public debt is equally true of private debt. Public agitation of the subject, sound discussion, a careful enumeration of the motives, an inventory of the productive power available to pay it, and a careful accounting of the amount and the date of its maturity, will as surely stem the tide of individual indebtedness as it has done the frenzy of public debt-creating. From the day the special agents of the Census Office started to overhaul the records of every recorder's office in every county, city, and town, the enumerators began to ask questions at the door of every farmhouse and home, and the Census Office commenced to send its individual debt schedules through the mails, the epoch of the last debt-creating mania was over, and a period of accounting, and earnest endeavor to face and overcome the danger, dawned.

From a statistical standpoint the work of collecting information in regard to mortgage indebtedness has been prosecuted with a success far beyond the anticipation of statisticians who have

studied the question for years. At the present writing it is impossible to estimate the full benefits which will be derived from such an investigation. The employment of a small army of 2,500 special agents and clerks to make an abstract of every mortgage placed on record throughout the United States for the last ten years has attracted attention to the danger of these encumbrances, to the enormous burdens in the way of interest, to the alarming extent to which usury is practised, and to the defectiveness of these records in all parts of the country. The agents of the Census Office have, as I have said, overhauled the records in every State and territory. They have travelled on horseback and on foot through the most sparsely-settled districts of our vast domain in search of mortgages, and have done their work so industriously and so thoroughly that we now have on file in Washington, as a result of their labor, the abstracts of about nine million mortgages. Some months before the inquiry was begun, Congress, and through Congress the public, were put in possession of the scope of the plan adopted. That plan, with hardly any change, has been successfully carried out. It comprised two distinct methods; one having the local records for the basis of operation, the other the population schedule, and hence the individual. The following table summarizes the results of this inquiry as far as possible to date:

	Alabama.	Iowa.	Kansas.	Tennessee.	Illinois.
Mortgages recorded, number	93,828	497,710	620,049	93,282	609,251
1880–1889, amount	$91,099,623	$431,288,542	$482,699,640	$100,212,257	$870,182,120
Mortgages in force, number	35,331	249,030	288,286	39,470	294,174
Jan. 1, 1890, amount	$39,027,983	$199,034,956	$235,185,108	$40,421,396	$384,299,620
Percentages of debt recorded 1880–89; in force Jan. 1, 1890	42.84	46.15	48.79	40.34	44.14
Number of acres and lots, acres	6,008,636	16,206,354	25,143,803	3,035,816	10,751,246
Encumbered Jan. 1, 1890, lots	14,213	160,550	263,197	32,957	168,247
Number of acres and lots, acres	16,175,153	32,627,928	53,768,190	7,269,279	21,447,578
Mortgaged 1880–89, lots.	34,649	292,097	530,865	65,566	602,000
Percentage of assessed acres encumbered Jan. 1, 1890	21.67	46.66	58.24	11.72	31.04
Equated life of mortgage (in years)	2.73	4.93	3.32	2.81	4.02
Range of interest rates (per cent.)	1–40	1–20	1–60	1–12	1–18
Amount per capita of mortgages in force Jan. 1, 1890	$26	$104	$165	$23	$100

The two important features brought out in the above table are the amount of mortgages placed on record each year for ten years, and the amount of the existing debt. The reader will readily understand that it would be absurd to accept the amount of the uncancelled mortgages as the amount of debt in force. Such an exhibit would manifestly be a gross exaggeration unworthy of confidence. The extent of this defect in the records has been ascertained by the Census Office in one hundred and two counties representing all parts of the country, and in sixty-one of these counties that have been tabulated the face of the uncancelled records exaggerates, on the average, the true amount of the debt by 71 per cent. It was therefore decided to make a transcript of the record in every case for ten years and ascertain therefrom the average life of a mortgage.

Preliminary experiments by special agents of the Census Office pointed to the use of the average life of mortgages, with an allowance for partial payments, as promising results much nearer the truth—near enough, at any rate, to be fairly conclusive as to the amount of existing indebtedness. This plan is approximately correct, and under perfectly uniform conditions would produce accurate results. An objection that can be raised against it is that mortgages are not uniform in amount and number recorded each year. These variations, however, when large amounts of debt are considered, are not as great as may be supposed, and under careful observation and corrective treatment lose much of their influence for error. If the average life of all mortgages under such circumstances is four years, and the total amount of the mortgages recorded within the last four years is taken as equivalent to the amount of indebtedness existing at the present time, it is evident that many paid mortgages created within the four years are included within the amount, and that many unpaid mortgages created more than four years ago are not included. In such cases it is true, if the average life of mortgages is correctly represented, that the mortgages of the life period of four years now paid are exactly equal to the mortgages made previously to the life period and now unpaid, so that the total recorded debt of the life period stands for the amount of debt in force.

Our agents were therefore instructed to abstract for every real-estate mortgage acknowledged and received within the ten years

ended December 31, 1889 (except mortgages made by public and quasi-public corporations), the following facts: The State and county in which the mortgaged real estate is situated; the year in which the acknowledgement was made; corporations, both as mortgageors and mortgagees, classified as savings banks, banks (including loan and trust companies, but not including savings banks), building and loan associations, insurance companies, mortgage corporations, and all others; the original amount of the debt; the actual rate of interest, or, if not ascertainable from records, the customary rate at the time; the number of encumbered acres and city or village lots; and also, for the cancelled mortgages of 1880–83, the full dates of acknowledgment and cancellation.

For the purpose of checking this inquiry, special investigations were conducted in one hundred and two counties well distributed throughout the United States, and representing every phase of American life and industry. In these counties the same facts were taken from the records as in other counties, and also, for all uncancelled mortgages as far back in time as any appreciable number of them were found in force, the names and addresses of the parties. Schedules were sent to these persons, and in each one of these counties an exact statement of existing debt has been compiled. The enormous cost would preclude this method for the whole country, but work in what are termed "inquiry" counties has been of great service in correcting the work elsewhere. The "inquiry" counties also reveal the purposes for which the debt was incurred. By far the largest proportion of real-estate mortgage debt has been incurred to secure the purchase of land, and the cost of improvements stands second in importance. The security of purchase money is generally 50 to 75 per cent. of the real-estate mortgage debt of the people of a county, and improvements generally represent from 10 to 20 per cent. of the debt.

A study of the table given above brings out the fact that the State of Kansas has, relatively speaking, a greater burden of indebtedness than any other of the five States in which the tabulation has been completed. Those who have taken up the debt cry for political purposes are apparently directing their entire energies to this State. Naturally the people of Kansas are considerably aroused on the subject, and, while admitting that the bur-

den of debt is great, vigorously protest at being made "a frightful example" for the rest of the Union. The people of Kansas might retaliate that debt is not always a sign of decay, but often an indication of prosperity; they might say the debt of Chicago is $24,373,170 more than the farm debt of Kansas, $42,703,564 more than the farm debt of Iowa, and $112,068,830 more than the entire mortgage debt of Alabama and Tennessee, and yet Chicago is one of the most prosperous cities in the Union to-day. And again they might with truth point out that the bulk of the debt in Alabama and Tennessee, the two Southern States tabulated, may be found in the counties in which are located Birmingham, Knoxville, Nashville, and Chattanooga, where the great industrial progress has taken place during the decade. The relation of the mortgage indebtedness to the true value of property is an element that should not be ignored in estimating the burden of debt. The estimate of $1,646,000,000 as the true value of all property, taxed and not taxed, for the State of Kansas is warranted by the facts. The mortgage indebtedness of the State, aggregating as it does $235,485,108, would therefore be 14.31 per cent. of the true valuation of all property in the State. In this estimate no account is taken of taxable property escaping taxation, which, in all communities, is known to be considerable.

Far be it from me to underestimate the burden of this debt. Still the people of Kansas have lots of pluck, unbounded energy, broad acres, great productive powers, and honestly intend to pay their debts. They will surely extricate themselves. The discussion of the subject, the gloomy prophecy of demagogues, and the facts as given by the Eleventh Census will bring the people to their sober senses, and a time of retrenchment and debt-paying will, I hope, be ushered in with a bountiful harvest this year.

In this article I have principally confined myself to the recorded real-estate indebtedness. The result of the direct inquiry as to the debt on farms and homes is not yet completed. The average farm and home debt, shown by tabulation of partial returns from counties distributed throughout the Union, is $1,288 for farms and $924 for homes. If these averages hold good for the United States, there is an existing debt in force of $2,500,000,000 on the farms and homes of the United States occupied by owners. Only some rough results of this inquiry are now known. It is probable that the number of families occu-

pying and owning mortgaged farms and homes does not exceed 2,250,000, leaving perhaps 10,250,000 families that hire their farms and homes or occupy and own them free of encumbrance. The total number of families occupying farms is supposed to be about 4,750,000, so that about 7,750,000 families occupy homes.

An attempt has been made in this article to give some conception of the magnitude of this one inquiry, and the unique results likely to be obtained. It has also been pointed out that, aside from the statistical results, which some of the most distinguished statisticians now recognize are likely to be of great importance, the moral effect of such an investigation is worth to the country many millions more than its cost. The investigation and agitation, in my opinion, are sure to be followed by retrenchment and debt-paying. It must also be borne in mind that, while the public debt at certain periods in the financial history of our States and minor civil divisions has been mostly created on account of a vehement desire to construct public works, so has the prime motive in the private debt been better fences, better barns, better homes, and more land for the farmer.

ROBERT P. PORTER.

ITALY AND THE POPE.

BY EX-PRIME-MINISTER CRISPI.

Part I.

Italy has the privilege of possessing in her capital city the head of the Catholic Church. This privilege is certainly not envied her by other nations, because it means, not that we have with us a minister of God, who exercises pacifically his spiritual power, but that we have with us a pretender to the throne who conspires against the unity and the liberty of the country.

After the fall of the temporal power, the Pope failed to show the Christian virtue of obedience to the laws of Providence, and to take up again the functions of his sovereign pontificate under the conditions in which it existed in the first years of the institution. If he had done this, he would have been an element in the peninsula of order and of love ; but in his actual attitude he is the cause of suspicion and of distrust, and he is regarded as an enemy against whom we are compelled to be on our guard, because, from one moment to another, he may disturb the public peace.

This abnormal state of things needs to be looked into from its beginning and in all its particulars. It is desirable to know the causes of this hostility of the church against the government which protects it and defends its independence ; it is desirable to see if the Italian Parliament has gone far enough—nay, if it has not gone too far—in its concessions, since it has given special privileges to one of the religions of the state at the peril of its own existence.

On October 2, 1870, the citizens of the Roman provinces voted by universal suffrage their annexation to the kingdom of Italy. With that plebiscitum the nation completed politically its

unity. Italy has expiated with centuries of slavery the crime of having conquered the world. The barbarians whom our ancestors attempted to civilize not only invaded the peninsula, but they cut it up and distributed it among themselves, without ever having had the virtue to reconstruct it. They have always envied its ancient grandeur, watching over its movements continually, and preventing it, as far as they possibly could, from achieving its own reconstruction.

It does not concern my present purpose to narrate all the things that have happened from the fourth century of the Christian era down to our times. I take Italy in 1815, and I will say that after the great French Revolution was subdued, which had awakened the most legitimate hopes and desires, Italy found herself divided as before, and impotent to defend herself against new foreign invasions. She had no voice in the councils of Europe.

Under the first Napoleon Italy was thus divided: Piedmont and Liguria were French departments, governed by French prefects; Rome was an imperial city; Tuscany belonged to the Princess Elisa; Naples to Murat; Sicily and Sardinia, which had resisted the omnipotence of the great captain, remained under the power of Ferdinand the Bourbon and of Victor Emmanuel; Lombardy, the Venetian territory, the Trentino, the Emilia, and the Marches, constituted into a single principality, had received, as if in derision of right and of history, the name of the Kingdom of Italy.

No better would have been the fate of our country if the Emperor, in his last great battles, had come out conqueror over the European coalition. I have before me now a letter written by him on the 12th of March, 1814, which sets forth his final word about Italy. Joachim Murat, when the star of Napoleon seemed declining, had declared for the enemies of France, and on the 11th of January, 1814, he had signed an agreement of alliance, offensive and defensive, with Francis I. of Hapsburg. Napoleon, on learning of this treason, wrote fiery letters to the King and Queen of Naples, and then, wishing to attempt to extinguish his brother-in-law by giving him as much as he had expected to get from his agreement with Austria, he wrote, on the 12th of March, 1814, to Eugène Beauharnais conformably with the project which had been made for Eugène of an arrangement with his loyal associate, and the promise of the partition of

the peninsula into two large states. The imperial letter was of such importance that it deserves to be transcribed.

"My son," wrote the Emperor, "I send you a copy of a very extraordinary letter which I have received from the King of Naples. Such sentiments are really inconceivable at a moment when France and myself are being assassinated. I have also received a letter written by you, with the project of a treaty sent to you by the King. I wish you now to send to this traitor an extraordinary agent, and make a treaty with him in my name. Do not touch Piedmont and Genoa, and divide the rest of Italy into two kingdoms. Let this treaty be kept secret until the Austrians have been driven out of the country, and twenty-four hours after it has been signed let the King declare himself and attack the Austrians. You may take any action in this direction. You must spare nothing, in our actual situation, to add to our efforts the efforts of the Neapolitans. Afterwards we can do what we like, for after such ingratitude and in such circumstances nothing need bind us."*

As the two parties could not agree, the will of the Emperor was not carried out. It is probable, however, so far as concerns Italy, that Murat would have been the man of whom we should have had least to complain. In a letter of the 23d of March, 1814, in which Eugène Beauharnais gave the Emperor an account of his negotiations, we read the following words, the significance of which cannot escape the reader:

"The Neapolitans insisted on laying down, as their first article, that the kingdom of Italy should be bounded by the Po and the Taro. They would then have consented to the establishment of the kingdom of northern Italy, but under the express condition that I should have sent the French troops beyond the Alps. Genoa and Piedmont were to make part of the kingdom of southern Italy."†

However, events went on, and Napoleon, twice conquered and twice compelled to abdicate, took with him to St. Helena useless remorse and repentance for his past. If he had constituted Italy into political unity,—and he could have done this, because he had all the elements,—it never would have been possible that he should have been thus ungratefully abandoned by his royal brother-in-law; and the two nations, France and Italy, united and harmonious, under the command of a single chieftain, might have fought the common enemy and easily overcome him.

When the Congress of Vienna was opened, after Waterloo, one single thought animated the princes there assembled; this was to enchain the people, so that they could not repeat the revolution which for twenty-six years had agitated Europe. Metter-

*N. Bianchi, "Storia Documentata della Diplomacia Europea," Vol. I., p. 336.
†Ibid, p. 334.

nich, speaking to Pareto, who represented at Vienna the interests of Genoa, informed him that the fashion was not then for republics; and to Gonfalonieri, the envoy of Beauharnais, and to the Duke of Campochiaro, the minister of Joachim Murat, he declared, with a sufficiently visible delight, that there was no room for revolutionary dynasties. Another anecdote still better characterizes that historic period of our Italian life. It is the deliberate proposition entertained by the Emperor Francis I. as to the name which should be given to the states which were ceded to him. To Austria were given in great part the provinces which had constituted the kingdom of Italy. His imperial, royal, apostolical majesty accepted the gift, but did not wish to take the name, because the words "Kingdom of Italy" were revolutionary, and might excite hopes which it was desirable to prevent, and which perhaps it might be necessary to repress. The Pope was restored, and with all the old dynasties in their ancient dominions. A principality for her life was established for the Empress Maria Louisa. Genoa was given to the King of Sardinia. The cabinet of Vienna, to which the Bourbon King of Naples had communicated a project for the political reorganization of his states and the abolition of the Sicilian constitution, gave this project its approbation.

All this insane work could not stand; and five years afterwards revolts broke out, in the north and in the south of the peninsula, which, though they were promptly repressed by foreign arms, planted the seeds of new aspirations and of new struggles among the citizens.

The name of Italy, during the wars of the first republic and the first empire, had become a beacon and a hope to the Italian populations, and the more they were struck down the stronger became their desire to see reconstituted their ancient mother country, no matter how bitter had been their undeceptions. General Bonaparte, when he first crossed the Alps, had evoked in his proclamations the memories of the ancient queen of the world, and in the name of Rome he had invited these enslaved populations to rise again for the restoration of their common country. Similar language had been afterwards used by Lord Bentinck, appearing with his fleet on the Ligurian coasts and calling upon the population to rise against the tyrant. Not less explicit had been the manifesto of King Joachim Murat in March, 1815, when, seeking the support of the Italians for the redemption of their land, he re-

minded them that the boundaries of the nation had been the inaccessible Alps and the sea. Finally, we must not forget a fact which dominates all other facts in the Neapolitan epopee, and that is the coronation of the Emperor and King of Italy on the 25th of May, 1805. The powerful despot, putting upon his head the iron crown, inspired the multitude, always easy to be deceived, with the hope that this was the beginning of the great work which could not long fail of accomplishment.

These modern memories were not without fruit for a people which lives upon classic thought. Publicists and poets kept alive in the hearts of the people the image of their country. In the schools, scholars and masters took part in this holy conspiracy of literature; and from Virgil to Dante, from Filicaja to Alfieri, from Foscolo to Leopardi, one hymn went up,—the misery in which Italy was kept, the necessity of insurrection to revive the ancient mother of the world, who had been condemned to be a slave whether victorious or vanquished. These voices of the soul had sufficed to establish the consciousness of their own duties in the hearts of the new generation, when arose Mazzini, apostle and conspirator, to organize the national forces for the day of deliverance.

Bitter but constant, despite the gallows and exile, was the life of Italy for forty years. Insurrection followed insurrection. Neither bloodshed nor repression availed to weary the people, who were always more bold, more determined, more unterrified, in the face of their tyrants. The year 1848, the year in which a spark from Palermo set fire to all Europe, appears to mark the end of the despots and the restoration of the nation. The treachery of princes and quarrels among the people, which gave the foreigners fresh opportunities to enchain them, made all our heroism useless and all our sacrifices of men and money vain. Charles Albert beaten at Novara, Venice and Rome trampled under foot by Austria and France, Italy fell back under the power of princes who for ten years longer kept up their ancient dominion, governing worse than before. Political protests against this oppression were the only relief of the people, and these were repeated until the day at last came of triumph and redemption.

As appears throughout what I have already said, the work of preparation was long and tempestuous; but fortunately, as we

shall see, the work of redemption was rapidly completed at last, since, in the course of twelve years, Italy succeeded in bringing herself together and accomplishing her unity. All the elements of the nation took part in this, even the least promising and the most unfavorable. Even errors and disasters were fruitful of good. The obstinacy of our tyrants was our good fortune, and foreign ambitions, for the most part fantastic, turned to our advantage. Our destiny was ripe; and the harmony of our people and the efforts of a king, citizen and soldier in one, concurred, in the fulness of time, to bring about our deliverance. This work began with the war of 1859, which in its consequences went far beyond the expectations of him who had inaugurated it. Napoleon threw his armies into Italy with a somewhat limited programme, and he had not the strength to execute it within the terms and under the conditions established by the treaty of Plombières, December, 1858. When he closed the war at Villafranca, he wished to establish a confederation of princes, but events were too strong for him. It came to pass that after the war was declared, and the Austrians had left the central provinces of the peninsula, the Emilia and Tuscany rose in arms, and the little dukes and the pontifical legates were constrained to fly.

The echo of this popular triumph came from the dominions of the Bourbon King. On the 4th of April, 1860, Palermo rose in arms, and on the 5th of May Garibaldi appeared in Sicily with his thousand men, fought, conquered, and in less than six months nine millions of Italians were freed from tyranny and united themselves to the nation.

In order that the revolutionary tempest might not reach the Tronto, and that the patrimony of St. Peter might be safe, General Cialdini was ordered to occupy the marches of Umbria. Nevertheless a people of twenty-five millions was gathered together and on the 17th of March, 1861, the Italian Parliament was enabled to proclaim the constitution of the kingdom of Italy.

Never had fortune smiled upon Italy as from 1859 to 1861. Austria had been defeated and had no allies; France had departed from the peninsula which she had liberated, and could not change her programme and turn against Italy the arms which had been

taken up against our enemies. It was thenceforth impossible that there should be any military agreement between the rival powers to impose upon us the treaty of Zurich. Their forced inertia secured our salvation. The enemies of our unity being impotent, popular movements and the annexations resulting from them could incur no hostility from foreign action.

After the Parliamentary act which manifested the unanimous will of the nation, the powers recognized the new kingdom. In this state of affairs only one more effort was necessary, and the edifice, to the erection of which God and man had contributed, would be completed and crowned. The war of 1866, fought on both sides of the Alps, gave us Venice ; and in 1870, the French troops, which were the only obstacle, being withdrawn,—an obstacle more political than material in the way of our liberty of action,—Rome came to Italy.

Before 1870, in a period of years which we may call our own, the temporal power of the Popes had been thrice abolished,—in 1798 by the people assembled at the capital after the entrance into Rome of the French troops under General Berthier ; on the 17th of May, 1809, by a decree of Napoleon I. ; and on the 9th of February, 1849, by a law of the Roman republic. The decrees of the 9th of October, 1870, and the law of the 31st of December of the same year were not, therefore, an innovation. We can only praise the exceptional mildness of the Italian Government and Parliament shown in an act of such importance.

In 1798 and in 1809 the Pope was absolutely driven from Rome ; and when the fate of the first empire hung in the balance and the conflict became more ardent, Napoleon sent Pius VII. to the advance posts of the army to keep him in check and perhaps to expose him to the fury of the French armies. In a letter written by the Emperor on the 12th of March, 1814, to Prince Eugène, I find these memorable words :

"I have given orders that the Pope should be sent by the way of Piacenza and Parma to the advance guard. I have given the Pope to understand that when he asked, as Bishop of Rome, to be allowed to return to his diocese, I gave him the permission. Be careful, therefore, not to enter into any negotiations about the Pope as to either recognizing or not recognizing him as sovereign."*

I do not wish to anticipate what I have to say about the papacy a little further on, but I feel that I should not close here

* N. Bianchi, Vol. I., p. 336.

this series of recollections of the French Revolution, and from what I have already said it will appear natural that I should bring the papacy face to face with our times, in order to show how unjust is the war waged by the Vatican against Italy.

In less than two lustres the French Revolution, in respect of religion and worship, assumed of all possible phases the most absurd; but its tendency was always the same in its laws and in its decrees—to use religion as an instrument of government. This began in 1790 with the civil constitution of the clergy, which sanctioned the abolition of church property, the popular election of ecclesiastical functionaries, the dependence of the Holy See on the French bishopric, and the oath imposed upon the clergy to support the laws of the state.

Afterwards, when Louis XVI. had been beheaded under the republican programme, Christianity was abolished, which was bad, and the new faith was substituted, the worship of Reason, which was worse. Religion neither can nor should be maintained by governments nor made a political institution. Religion is born of faith and of the conscience; and faith and the conscience alone should nourish and sustain it. Citizen Robespierre, the high priest and dictator, was a melancholy imitation of the pope-king, and quite as melancholy it was to see the existence of the republic guaranteed by proscription. Eight years afterwards Catholicism was restored by the first consul, but it was under conditions which made the clergy the nominees and the stipendiaries of the government, so that the ecclesiastical policy of the country was exclusively controlled by the civil authorities, and jurisdiction over the priests was exercised by the Council of State.

Pius VII. accepted this state of things in the Concordat of 1801, and he gave fresh importance to it in 1804, when, moved by ambitious desires of temporal advantage, he went to Paris to consecrate and crown the new Emperor. He made a mistake, for he did not receive back the territory which Pius VI. had lost at the treaty of the Tolentino, and the provinces which had remained in the power of the Holy See were taken away from him by the decree of May 17, 1809. All this, of course, irritated the Roman pontiff and made him an enemy of the monarchy which he himself had canonically legitimatized.

After this, reasons of state imposed a somewhat rigorous necessity of precautions against which the pontifical curia, discon-

tented with the new order of things, began conspiring against the established government. Napoleon abolished all ecclesiastical jurisdictions, the holy office, all the barbaric institutions with which the Pope is surrounded, and, annexing the states of the holy church to France, extended to them the political system of 1789. Pius VII. then shut himself up in the Quirinal, assuming the attitude of a prisoner, and replied to the civil action of the French Government by publishing a bull of excommunication, in which Napoleon was not named, but was plainly indicated, because the spiritual thunder was hurled against all who had refused to acknowledge the authority of the Pope, and against the authors and accomplices of all acts of spoliation committed upon the patrimony of St. Peter. It is clear that after this the strife between the two powers necessarily must have become more intense.

On the 17th of June, 1809, Napoleon wrote Murat :

"You will have seen by my decrees that I have done the Pope a great deal of good, but only on the condition that he will keep quiet. If he undertakes to make a combination of caballeros and conspirators, like Cardinal Pacca and the rest, this shall not be tolerated, and I shall act at Rome as I have acted with the cardinal archbishop of Paris. I wish to give him this explanation. You must speak plainly to the Pope and not allow any sort of difficulty. The military commissions must do justice on the monks and on anybody else who commits any excesses." *

Two years afterwards, in another letter, the Emperor added :

"I let you know that my intention was to have things move rapidly at Rome and to make no terms with any kind of opposition. No asylum whatever shall be respected if there is resistance to my decrees, and no resistance must be suffered on any pretext whatever. If the Pope, against the spirit of his position and of the gospel, preaches revolt and undertakes to use the immunity of his house to have circulars printed, you must arrest him. The time for this sort of thing is over. Philippe le Bel had Boniface arrested, and Charles V. kept Clement VII. a long time in prison, and these had done less. The priest who preaches discord and war against temporal powers, instead of peace, abuses his authority." †

Deeds followed words. On the 6th of July, 1809, at three o'clock in the morning, the French *gendarmes* scaled the walls of the Quirinal, went in through the windows, and reached the apartments of Pius VII. He was arrested in his sacerdotal dress, put into a carriage, driven from city to city, from Florence to Alexandria, because no one wished to receive so inconvenient a prisoner, and when he reached Grenoble he was sent back again to

* Thiers's "History of Consulate and Empire," Brussels edition, Milene, Vol. III., p. 261.

† Ibid.

Italy by the order of the Emperor, who wrote as follows to his Minister of Police:

"It is my intention that the Pope shall not come into France. If he is still on the Riviera of Genoa, the best place where he can be put is Savona. There is there a sufficiently large house where he might be properly lodged until we know what is to be done. If he gets over his lunacy, I have no objection to his being sent back to Rome." *

In consequence of this, Pius VII. was taken to Savona, but Napoleon did not get the satisfaction he required, and, changing the intention he had at that time expressed, to wit, that the Pope ought to have a residence of his own, he conceived the plan that Paris should be the centre of the two powers, temporal and spiritual. Thereupon he ordered the removal to Paris of the cardinals, of the generals of all the religious orders, of the functionaries of the Roman chancery, of the *dateria*, and of the *penitenzieria*, and he ordered the removal to Paris of the pontifical archives. To this end the Emperor wrote to the Minister of Police, on the 15th of September, 1809:

"I have already given orders that all the generals of the orders and the cardinals who have no bishopric or do not receive any honor, whether they be Italians or Tuscans or Piedmontese,† shall come to Paris; and probably I shall make an end of all this by bringing here the Pope himself, whom I shall establish somewhere in the environs. It is proper that he should be at the head of Christendom."‡

After the decree and the law which abolished the temporal power of the Pope, Italy did nothing of this kind. The Pope for twenty years has been living in the Vatican, surrounded by the cardinals, by the functionaries of the church, inviolable and unviolated, a constant and incorrigible conspirator.

Of the political institutions which arose in Europe during the middle ages, the most absurd were the monastic and ecclesiastical. To the feudal system, which had for itself the mere argument of force, to the king who held supreme authority, the church was not content to oppose its spiritual power, and when it could it wished to unite with this a temporal power. Germany was the country in which, more than elsewhere, these ecclesiastical states abounded; there were more than thirty of them, the titular chiefs of which were electors of the empire, and three of these,

* Ibid, p. 263.

† It will be observed that to Napoleon the Piedmontese and the Tuscans were not Italians.

‡ Thiers's "History of Consulate and Empire," Vol. III., p. 263.

the most powerful archbishops of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne, were arch-councillors of the empire. France and Belgium had such prelate-kings; Italy also had some. To these we must add the religious corporations, which also exercised civil power, and the Order of St. John of Jerusalem and that of the Teutonic Knights. In the one and in the other of these orders the members were monks and soldiers, and their chief was invested with civil sovereignty. The papacy was at the head of all, and had under it, in France, Avignon with the Venousin; in Italy, the territory which bore the name of the patrimony of St. Peter.

It is not necessary to recall the origin of these dominions; it is sufficient to observe that they were swept away by the hurricane of the French Revolution, and the only one of them restored in 1815 was the Holy See. Napoleon, in his decree of the 17th of May, 1809, to establish the legitimacy of his authority,—he, the restorer of the Western Empire,—recalled the fact that Charlemagne had established Rome and the provinces as a feudal part of his own monarchy. Italy has quite another reason, more logical, more powerful, which makes truly legitimate her abolition of the civil authority of the holy church. We have no need to discuss the authenticity of the imperial donations or the false decretals or the violent acts of Julius II., or the astute manœuvres of his successors. The Pope for us had no greater rights than the other princes whom we dispossessed.

The origin of the dynastic states was the same. It was the treaty of 1815, or, in other words, it was foreign violence. The day on which Italy established her political unity it ceased to be possible that Rome should remain outside of the national orbit. No fragment of the territory of our country can be excluded from the common life or condemned to slavery. Its reintegration is a question only of time, but the right cannot be contested. Let us add that by tradition and by its prestige, after the new kingdom was established, it became the only capital before which the other great cities—Naples, Florence, Turin, Milan—could lay down their legitimate mission.

And I have some other not less important considerations to submit to the consideration of my readers. Rome under the Pope was a gangrene spot which must have poisoned the whole body of the nation. From 1860 onward it had become the asylum of all

the fallen dynasties, a cave of brigands who infested the southern provinces of the peninsula. This being stated, the redemption of the Eternal City was not only a logical consequence of the restoration of Italian right; it was necessary to the pacification of the country.

For a people, the right to exist in freedom and independence long antedates any reason of princes or any international treaty. Conquest, usurpation, the insidious good luck of a despot, may suspend the exercise of this right, but they do not diminish it; much less can they slay it. Eternal, imprescriptible, within its natural limits, the nation reassumes its own autonomy almost as soon as it has freed itself from the grasp of sacerdotal and civil tyranny.

The question of the temporal power of the Pope has troubled for many years the minds of all Italian statesmen. Certainly it has been for us the most difficult to deal with in consequence of the character of universality which the head of the church possesses in virtue of his mission. When Cavour had determined that the temporal power must come to an end, through pacific means and by an agreement with the Catholic world, that illustrious minister was the first in our time to undertake seriously the study of means to achieve this end. He died too soon to witness the failure of his policy. Garibaldi was prevented from cutting the Gordian knot; but without the cannon the Porta Pia would never have been opened to the nation to take possession of its capital.

From contemporary publications and from the correspondence of Cavour, issued by Rue & Co. at Turin, it appears that so early as 1860 the great minister had attempted to open negotiations with the Holy See. This explains the motive with which Baron Ricasoli then dispersed the Garibaldian legion which had been collected in Tuscany to invade the Roman territory. Count Cavour made a confidant of Dr. Diomed Pantaleoni, whom he describes, in a letter of October, 1856, as the most faithful and most distinguished expression of the Liberal Moderate party.* Later on were associated with Dr. Pantaleoni, Passaglia and Bertelli, general of the Rosminians. In the Holy College, Cardinals Santucci and d'Andrea were favorable to an understanding between the Holy See and Italy. Communication with these

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. VI., p. 44.

cardinals was carried on through the Abbé Antonio Isaia, secretary of Cardinal d'Andrea. Before the 28th of September, 1860, Count Cavour had sent to Rome his proposals for an agreement in which guarantees should be given for the spiritual independence of the Pope and for the exercise of his spiritual authority in the Catholic world.*

At that time Cavour inquired whether it would not be well to unite Padre Pagani, another Rosminian, in the conduct of these negotiations, and if it would not be well to send a secret agent who should be intrusted with the whole secret thought of the government and the whole confidence of Cavour, so that we might succeed in securing a complete persuasion of the necessity of the proposals which this agent should be charged to make and to receive.

The basis of the agreement with the Holy See was to be the abandonment of the temporal power and the establishment of the King of Italy at Rome. As we shall see further on, Cavour was very liberal in the concessions he would have made to the Vatican. They were excessive, and we ought to thank God that they were not accepted. It appears that Pius IX. and Antonelli in the beginning hesitated over the suppression of the civil principality of the church. In a telegram of the 13th of January, 1861, which one of the negotiators sent to Rome, we read :

"Santucci, notwithstanding my objections, thought it his duty to tell everything to the Pope, who asked him what this project of agreement was. Cardinal Santucci spoke to him of the inevitable loss of the temporal power. The proposals were received in a friendly spirit. The Pope shows himself resigned to everything. Antonelli was called in. He at first opposed, but finally resigned himself also to the circumstances, and asked the Pope to release him and Santucci from their oath, in order that they might be able to treat about the possible surrender of temporal power. They will see Passaglia on Friday, the 13th, and he, on their behalf, asks me to have him nadem to officially negotiate, or, if not him, somebody else from this place or from Turin."†

The suppression of the temporal power was to be made in a form which had a flavor of feudalism. The Pope, reserving to himself the eminent domain, was to cede in perpetuity to Victor Emmanuel and to his successors the vicarate and civil government of the patrimony of St. Peter. The personal guarantees were to be all the prerogatives of sovereignty, assuring to the Pope per-

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. IV., p. 102.
† Ibid. p. 107.

sonal inviolability and immunity within his palaces, inviolability of the conclave and of the camerlengo during a vacancy of the Holy See ; the Pope to have the right to send nuncios and to receive legates from foreign governments and to enjoy, in respect of them, all personal and territorial immunity ; the Pope to receive for the maintenance of his court property sufficient to maintain the dignity of the Holy See. On the part of Rome it was asked, furthermore, that this agreement should be guaranteed by the Catholic powers in an international undertaking. But Count Cavour objected to consent to this. He replied that he would accept the good offices of the powers, but he could not admit any guarantee or other similar bond, which might give pretext for complications and foreign intervention. Other propositions were made to complete the first suggestions, in which other rights and greater prerogatives were asked for the clergy. Cavour did not oppose these, and, with some modifications, would have accepted them. †

CRISPI.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

† Ibid, p. 103.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

POSSIBILITIES OF WASHINGTON SOCIETY.

To A newcomer in Washington the social possibilities are delightfully suggestive. Where else, indeed, in our country are so many men of diverse powers congregated? And where else do such men mingle freely in society? They are of every shade of political opinion, of course, as well as representative of every interest in the country; for if the drawing-room is hardly as yet neutral ground, it offers a certain degree of hospitality to friend and to foe, and will do so with more and more cordiality, as it is realized that society, like patriotism, unites those whom politics divides.

To forward such harmony is to work in a good cause, and not only can this be done, but a true society can be formed which shall create and be created by a standard of taste wholesomely American. The foundation is already laid here as nowhere else in the United States for a society that shall include both sexes, the only kind worth having or that can be permanently maintained; a society that understands something of the importance of etiquette—a form of culture as necessary to good society as grammar is to language; a society, finally, in which persons one would go half across the continent to meet, rub shoulders with the humblest in the crush of a President's reception or at the house of a cabinet officer. But what is the result? One cannot deny that as yet it is entirely inadequate. Society as an end does not produce results commensurate with the means employed, and society as a means is not society in the true sense at all. It is, like any other transitory gathering at a theatre or hotel, without cohesion or significance. It gives birth to no *esprit de corps*, and failing in this any organization lacks persistence and loyalty. The individual simply loses his individuality and is merged in the mass, which becomes like a mush of grapes that have lost their wholeness as fruit and have not yet become wine.

At present, whatever lasts beyond the day of an entertainment is almost wholly of a utilitarian character. People must do this and that in order not to offend, in order to propitiate, in order to gain votes for the party or influence for a cause, or what not, that utilizes society for some other end than its own; whereas society should be the artistic product of a discriminating people, through the means of refined companionship.

This does not at all signify an attempt to imitate the French *salon*. One might as well try to revive the megatherium. The *salon* as France had it was a product of the times, which have changed in almost every detail since then. What America needs is a form of society that shall attract and preserve the best social material. Of course the form must be democratic, for that is the spirit of our age and people; but to be democratic does not signify that all men are alike either by nature or culture. Society cannot regard them, as the ballot does, solely from the standpoint of quantity; it must take cognizance also of quality. Green of Oxford is reported to have said

that to make every Englishman a gentleman was the aim of English civilization. This does not mean that the standard of what constitutes a gentleman should be lowered so as to admit every one without regard to his fitness, but that each one should be fit. The sharp retort of a lady on being asked to receive a boor who was praised for being "a diamond in the rough" might oftener be acted upon. "Then he should be cut," said she.

To be a gentleman is, however, within the power of almost every man. It does not mean to have wealth, nor to have power, nor to have even knowledge; in short, it is not having at all—it is being. A self-made man whose chief ambition it is to "represent" one or a hundred millions of dollars, or a hundred thousand votes, does not usually care to take the time and thought to make himself fit for presentation in society; though that a self-made man may be the truest gentleman is known through experience by most of us; and the method is ably shown in "John Halifax, Gentleman." On the other hand, a man of birth, education, and outward refinement should not be admitted in society if he can be impeached for conduct unbecoming a gentleman; and what is unbecoming is exactly what a true social standard must decide.

We need to cultivate strenuously a Greek sense of limits that shall know how to choose and refuse, and that shall not be afraid of choosing what is consistent with an enlightened conception of society as an end in itself, nor of refusing whatever conflicts with it. Any adequate standard must be based on character; not mental or moral character alone, but on the whole man or woman as he or she is. At present Washington society fritters away great opportunities, regardless of what might be achieved with a little thought and organized determination. Wealth, ostentation, political power, and the mere aggregation of numbers are fast suffocating the finer qualities of social life, fostering vulgarity, and blunting the sense of social taste. It is a delicate sense, and should be refined instead of dulled. To keep it pure and render it discriminating is no small part of patriotic duty, for the dangers of wealth and corruption are especially great to a republic.

The responsibility rests with the resident population of the capital. The society of official life is necessarily superficial, and impotent to make distinctions. It cannot choose whom it will exclude or receive, for officials are not only public servants, but are looked upon as public property. Moreover, they are here to-day and at the antipodes to-morrow, and can therefore have no adequate *esprit de corps*.

If, then, a dozen or twenty households, already well established, and possessors of both courage and a discriminating social taste, would form a league as quietly as might be to choose carefully whom they would invite and whom they would ignore, being guided solely by the motive of establishing a worthy social nucleus in the capital of the nation, they would create a permanent good, capable of growth and of incalculable refining and purifying influence on the future of the republic. It should base itself on a sound simplicity, so far as material things are concerned, in order that expense need be of little moment, and on an acute social sense of the congeniality of individuals and the temper of a gathering as a whole. It is said that in regard to eloquence the taste of the House of Commons is higher than that of the man of greatest taste within it. So it is with society. The refinement of attrition with equal minds, the wisdom that results from the blending of knowledge, the grace that comes from universal courtesy, and the easy assurance of those not afraid of committing a blunder—these are some of the gains such a social form would give to those capable of entering it. For it

should not be exclusive except of what would destroy it. It should be inclusive of all the good in the stream of people constantly flowing through the country. And what a stream this is to draw from! No other city offers us such advantages. If the nucleus were permanent, those invited might shift without injury to the central idea; and thus each turn of the political wheel would bring men of note from different parts of the nation who could be drawn in during their long or short tenure of office to brighten and enlarge the conservative brain of the organization; a common consciousness, alive to all changing impressions, yet capable of retaining the good of them permanently in a way that would waste nothing, but, on the contrary create continually new and higher forms. Under such circumstances, each individual would have the opportunity of bringing forth his or her best by union with the highest social achievements of all. Whether blossom or fruit, it should be welcome, for fragrance and beauty have their place no less securely than flavor and nourishment. Indeed, as Anglo-Saxons we can be safely trusted to take care of our nourishment, but we need stimulation to bring sufficient beauty into our lives. Surely, however, we are old enough as a social whole to have grown beyond the simple needs of the infant—food and warmth. These we can get at almost any entertainment, as also the satisfaction of the savage, who adds to the infant's wants those of clothing and shelter. Such demands are undeniably primitive. Let us strive for something more adequate to our desires as civilized human beings,—intelligent conversation, the play of minds at ease, the delicacy of gentle breeding, which far from leaving diamonds in the rough, makes jewels of common stones.

L. B. HALSTED.

THE HUMAN AMŒBOID.

WHEN my friend awoke the morning after a night at the club and facetiously spoke of himself as a "demoralized community," he probably did not intend to give a scientific description of himself. But that is exactly what his time-honored witticism was: he was literally a demoralized community.

Each of the millions of individuals which make up the grand resultant known as my convivial friend has a life-history of its own; each has its birth, followed by successive periods of growth, maturity, and decline, ending in death; and the night's festivities at the club had their demoralizing effect upon each individually, as well as upon the community collectively.

There is a scientific foundation for the town of Mansoul to rest upon that the Bedford Tinker never dreamed of in all his wonderful dreaming. Those embattled walls, with their eye-gate, their ear-gate, and all their other gates, the dwellings, strongholds, streets, alleys, and crowded population within, are more than the baseless fabric of a dream.

The individual in the microcosmic community is the amœboid cell. When it begins its life as a white blood-corpuscle, it is scarcely distinguishable from that little creature so familiar to the microscopist, the amœba. It swims along in the hæmal river, like a little fish in the Mississippi, in quest of food, oxygen, and its final destiny. What that destiny is to be there is nothing about it as yet to determine. As there is no telling whether a particular infant is to become doctor, lawyer, merchant, or priest, president or hod-carrier, so there is no telling in what sphere of usefulness this little creature may settle when it has finished its career of independent roaming. It may rise to a seat in the House of Lords, on the Supreme Bench, or in the

Royal Academy, all of which august bodies hold their meetings beneath the cerebral dome; it may take a booth in one of the markets along the shores of the Alimentary Canal; it may go into the business of transportation in the Grand Cardiac Depot; into telegraphy on one of the Neural Lines; into the street-cleaning and garbage-removing department on Pulmonary Avenue, Renal Park, or Hepatic Square; its humble lot may be that of a common laborer in the Biceps Flexor or the Triceps Extensor, or, humblest of all, that of a half-alive, underground worker in the Bony System. But whether its lot be high or low, it will be one of absolute specialization.

The amœba has been called a zoölogical paradox, because it moves without muscles, feels and perceives without nerves, eats and digests without a mouth or stomach, breathes without lungs, gills, or branchiæ—in short, performs all the essential functions of a living being without organs. It is, however, no more truly a paradox zoölogically than the lowest races of savages are a paradox economically, who without being professional armorers arm themselves, without being professional tailors or mantua-makers clothe themselves (in a way), without being professional architects, farmers, provision-dealers, bakers, or fishermen, shelter and feed themselves. The savages simply are not armed, clothed, sheltered, or fed as well as those more favored classes who dwell in organized, differentiated society, where each individual has, or is supposed to have, his own special work to do, and to each of whom it is no reproach that he cannot do the work of other specialists.

It is not true that the amœba moves without muscle: the creature is itself a single muscular cell. Neither does it feel and perceive without nerves: its whole body is a single nerve cell. At the same time it is a digestive and assimilative cell, an oxygen-absorbing and carbonic-acid-excreting cell,—it may even be (as in the case of the *foraminifera*, which are only amœbæ secreting a limy test around themselves) a bone cell. Having so many diverse functions to perform all at once, it cannot, of course, excel in the performance of any one of them, as the savage Jack-of-all-trades, to whom we have compared it, cannot compete in the performance of any one of his numerous functions with his civilized and specialized brother.

If the amœba-like white blood-corpuscle roaming along the hæmal current is finally drafted as a recruit to some wasted muscle, it becomes at once specialized, its whole vital energy being concentrated upon its one duty of contracting or expanding at the bidding of its nerve-masters. So to whatever other tissue it may be attached, whether nervous, vascular, or osseous, for the remainder of its brief life all its energy is devoted to the performance of its single function.

As in the microcosm, so in the macrocosm: each individual is at first a white blood-corpuscle in the body politic. And the great organism of which he becomes (or may become) a mere specialized cell, exists not for his particular benefit, nor for that of any individual or class of his fellows, but for itself *as* an organism. As such it is improving at the expense of its individuals. It is making great and rapid strides in its mastery over the forces of nature, in its stores of information in all departments of knowledge, in the cultivation of art and artisanship. Men are better housed, lighted, warmed, clothed, and fed than ever before; they travel with greater speed, comfort, and economy; they are better protected from disease and violence; they have better means of intercommunication and exchange of commodities; in short, all the conditions of organized society are wonderfully improved, and

are still improving with ever-increasing rapidity. And yet man as an *individual* is deteriorating, not in spite of, but in consequence of, these prodigious ameliorations in his condition.

Multiplying and magnifying the means of improvement and enjoyment, without at the same time correspondingly lengthening the term of life and enlarging the receptive capacity, offer but one advantage, that of *choice*; and this very advantage has the effect of increasing the tendency to specialization, which is only another name for narrowness. It does not swell the man into a larger sphere, but simply sharpens him to a finer point.

The world has already made too much history and eminent biography. The broadest mind, the most tenacious memory, can comprehend but the barest outlines, and for adequate study must content itself with fragments. The same applies to science, art, everything. Hence everywhere the race of man is told off into details. The intellectual class divides up its domain into lots, and assigns them to its settlers, as the United States Government assigns its territorial freeholds. The sky is partitioned off among astronomers like so much Western territory. In philology one man devotes his life to the third declension of one language, and at the end laments that he "has not confined himself to the dative case."

In the arts it is still worse. Time was when one man made a watch. Now he makes only one small part of it. As a result the product is greatly improved, but the *producer* is deteriorated in still greater degree.

Enlarging the scope of action in all directions, when the scope was already too large, has very much the same effect that enlarging the earth itself would have—it proportionately diminishes the individual actor.

When, countless æons hence, Jupiter and Saturn shall be inhabited, the Jovian and the Saturnian man will be as much smaller than the terrestrial man as those giant plants are greater than the earth. Not so, however, with the Jovian and the Saturnian races. For our hundreds they will number their tens of thousands. The amœboid cells which make up the body of a frog are larger than those of a man, and each may be capable of a greater diversity of action; but compare the resultants of their coördinated action!

Shall we lament the specialization and consequent deterioration of the individual man, which thus results in the higher differentiation and finer organization of the race as a whole? or shall we school ourselves to that philanthropy which can rejoice, not in the glory of a man, but of mankind?

This is the ideal philanthropy. The truly great philanthropist is as careless of the single life as nature herself where the welfare of the race is concerned. Who are the "unborn millions" for the sake of whom we give our lives by the thousands on the battlefield? We do not think of them individually. They are only the living, coördinated cells of a vast living, breathing organism whose name is Posterity. And when the health of that great Being is imperilled, we do not hesitate to be cut off and thrown away any more than the cellular fibres of our arm would rebel at the surgeon's knife. A man is a little thing, but "many a mickle maks a muckle."

EDWARD P. JACKSON.

NO STARVATION IN RUSSIA.

ON MY arrival in this country I find your journals discussing with much ability and natural fervor the brilliant prospect of a great influx of European gold into America to result from the enormous demand which Europe is ex-

pected to make upon the splendid harvests of your great West. I am not a merchant, and I do not pretend to know how large is the normal demand made by Europe upon your American grain fields. But I have passed very recently through the southern and western provinces of the Russian Empire, through Germany, through eastern France, and through Great Britain, on my way from the Caucasus to the United States. I have been told that the actual results of the harvest of 1891 in Germany, in eastern France, and in Great Britain are much better than were anticipated in the summer, and that no fear exists in any of those countries of an unusual dearth of cereal products. And I read with amazement that what is true of western Europe is not true of Russia. I read that the people are actually starving throughout a great part of the European dominions of the Czar; that the officers of the Russian army and the Russian nobility are retrenching their usual expenditure in order to avert a general famine, and even that the government of my country has forbidden the conservation of any grain for the sowing of next year's crops! If I did not know that three-fourths of the Continental press are now controlled by the Jews, and that the Jews are in possession of the great news agencies such as Wolff's and Reuter's, all this would astonish me indeed!

There are more than two million square miles of territory in European Russia inhabited by more than ninety millions of loyal subjects of the Czar. Out of this enormous area the crops of 1891 are bad in five *oblasts*, or provinces, to my knowledge, comprising less than 90,000 square miles, and inhabited by about eight millions of people. This means absolute distress in certain restricted regions. It means no more. There are districts of Ireland in which the potato crop is defective this year. There is a territory covering two million acres, called Oklahoma, I read, in your own great country, where there are no crops, and where human beings are dying of starvation. But Ireland is not famine-stricken in 1891, nor are the United States, nor is the Russian Empire. The ukase of the Czar forbidding the exportation of rye and oats has been made a pretext for this monstrous story. That ukase was issued for military reasons, not economical reasons. Since August 1 more than 300,000 Russian troops—a majority of them Cossack cavalry and light troops—have been moved into southwestern Russia from the East. There are now 640,000 troops of all arms established for precautionary and disciplinary purposes between Odessa and the Pruth and Warsaw. To secure the comfort and efficiency of this vast body of troops, the Russian Government gave orders months ago for the concentration in these provinces of adequate supplies of grain of the necessary kinds; and as it was notorious that the Jew grain-brokers always try to raise the domestic price, especially to the government, of grain, when they scent an unusual demand by forced exportations, the ukase forbidding such exportations was suggested by the able Imperial Finance Minister Vischnegradsky, approved by the Czar, and issued. I have seen the good effects of it in the healthy and vigorous appearance of the men and the horses of the forces under General Vladimiroff and General Grodno at every point of my recent journey. Disappointed of their profits in Russia, the Jews are perhaps now speculating in America on the effect of these tales of a great European famine and consequent great demand for American grain. I rejoice that you have so noble a harvest. I hope you will have a wide and remunerative sale for its golden treasures. But if the Germans and the Austrians who are now encouraging disloyalty in the cities of Poland count

upon a famine in Russia to weaken the arm of the empire, they count without their host.

SERGIUS V.

THE COMING GLACIAL AGE.

WHEN men are told that by far the stronger probability is that countless ages hence the solar system will be frozen to death than that it will be burned to death, their gaze is immediately turned groundward again. "After us the deluge," and that is long, long after the deluge.

Our pity for the woes of remote posterity is, if possible, feebler and more vague than that we feel for those who suffered in the remote past. The smallest members of the solar system, the moons, have already suffered glacial death. Can we shiver in sympathy with the last lunar equatorial inhabitants who may have held up their icy hands imploringly to the sun? As from cycle to cycle the sun shrinks more and more, and thus expends his vast stores of latent energy, planet after planet will succumb, we are told, until, last of all, the sun himself will go out in the blackness of darkness forever.

Forever? Then what will become of the enormous amount of expended energy? Speculative science has thus far offered no satisfactory answer to the question. The indestructibility of energy is a law of physics as well established as that of the indestructibility of matter. "Radiated into space" is no adequate explanation. Empty space, or, rather, the ethereal *plenum*, which is the only thinkable environment of masses of matter lighting and heating one another, held together by mutual gravitation, cannot retain within itself the smallest tremor of the energy it transmits, or else the most powerful telescope could never reveal to us the trembling ray that has been millions of years on its journey. The explanation that it is "dissipated and rendered unavailable in the form of heat"—in other words that all "strain and stress are relieved and equilibrium established"—is scarcely more satisfying. Its apparent fallacy may, perhaps, be made plain by a somewhat "violent" hypothesis. *Disce omnia ex uno.*

Let the whole universe be represented by two atoms, which we will suppose to be placed originally (say) one millimetre apart. Then the force of their mutual gravitation multiplied by one millimetre may represent the total potential energy of the universe at the beginning of the processes now going on. In obedience to their mutual attraction, they move toward one another with accelerating velocity. This motion may stand for all the phenomena which have occurred since the beginning; otherwise, for the conversion of the potential energy of the universe to kinetic energy. Finally, at their maximum velocity, the two atoms come into contact. This, of course, represents the period when the condensation of matter shall have reached its maximum, when all latent energy shall have been expended and "radiated into space." But will the two atoms remain in contact? No; by the inevitable law of dynamics they will rebound and return to their original positions, when the process will be repeated, and so on *ad infinitum.*

If two atoms would act thus, so would four atoms; so would millions Why not the universe itself? What is the true meaning of the term "unavailable energy"? What would correspond to it in the position or movements of the pair of atoms supposed?

WALTER J. GRACE.

As adversity and opposition toughen the mental and moral fibre and temper the spirit of man, so riches and easily-acquired success enervate the strongest character and unfit it for protracted effort. It is the same with nations. War arouses all the latent energies of a people, stimulates them to the highest exertion, and develops their mental and material resources.

History presents few finer pictures than that of the Roman Senate thanking Varro at the city gates because, after Cannæ, "he had not despaired of the republic." Steeled by incessant warfare to an inflexible resolution, not gold, but Rome's best blood, was named by those stern Senators, in that desperate hour, as the price of liberty.

But the "cankers of a calm world and long peace" atrophize the active forces, and luxury becomes more destructive than the sword.

Rome, once mistress of the world, the seat of arts, empire, and glory, fell by corruption to a state of sloth, ignorance, and poverty. From "virtuous industry," says the historian, "it passed to wealth; from wealth to luxury; from luxury to an impatience of discipline and corruption of morals; till, by a total degeneracy and loss of virtue, being grown ripe for destruction, it fell at last under the hand of the oppressor; and, with the loss of liberty, losing everything that was valuable, sank gradually again into its original barbarism." Such is the law of the rise and fall of nations.

But for war the civilization we now enjoy would have been impossible. The swath cut by the reaper's sickle through fields of ripened grain is not more marked than the way cut by the sword for the path of human progress. "Westward the star of empire took its way," for westward set the tide of conquest.

The imposing wave of barbaric triumph swept from Asia across the Ægean Sea, only to be turned back by united Greece armed in the sacred cause of liberty. The battles of Marathon, Salamis, and Platæa were only so many stepping-stones towards an ascendency of Hellenic civilization, the influence of which on human affairs can never die. Without war Greece would have lived on æstheticism and wasted its life in idle dreams.

The overthrow of the Persian Empire by the trained soldiers of Macedonia, it has been well observed, is the first great revolution in the affairs of mankind of which we have knowledge. The

fall of Carthage and the elevation of Rome from the same cause —disciplined troops—are the second. These were great strides in the course of human progress. Hannibal's long and devastating campaigns in Italy moulded through years of battle the martial Roman of a later day, as already noted, and prepared the City of the Seven Hills, as no discipline but war could have prepared her, to reign mistress of the world, and give laws and letters to nations then unborn. "No power," remarks a modern historian, "was ever based on foundations so sure and deep as those which Rome laid during three centuries of conquest."

Says a profound student of biblical literature: "The world, before it was ready to accept Hellenism and Christianity, had to be prepared and made smooth for centuries beforehand. A great humanizing force had to be created—a force powerful enough to beat down the obstacles which local patriotism offered to the idealistic propaganda of Greece and Judea. Rome fulfilled this extraordinary function. Rome, by prodigies of civic virtue, created the force of the world, and this force served to propagate the work of Greece and the work of Judea—that is to say, civilization." The Roman legions supplied the force.

The eagles of Cæsar spread through western Europe, and among the rude Britons, the seeds of civilization, and prepared the way for higher forms of political life. Later on, generations of fierce contention between the Dane and Saxon, Angle and Norman, on the soil of Britain, fused these various peoples into the English-speaking race of the present day. Thus by war were amalgamated three branches of the great Teutonic family with each other and with the original Briton. The Great Charter, wrung from King John by those iron barons, "sword in hand," as Sir William Blackstone tells us, united the Normans and the Saxons and forms the first chapter in the history of the English nation. The Great Charter and the Bill of Rights, and the principles of civil and religious liberty they embody, are the priceless heritage of every American. Their full enjoyment, it must be remembered, cost "rivers of English blood." Transplanted to the shores of America, those principles assumed, according to the law of evolution, still higher forms; but their possession had first to be won and then maintained by the sword.

From the "blue Cyclades" to the slopes of the Pacific, war has made possible the slow, but certain, development of the great

Public Library
DORCHESTER BRANCH

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXXI.

DECEMBER, 1891.

THOUGHTS ON THE NEGRO PROBLEM.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES BRYCE.

AMONG the problems which the people and government of the United States have to deal with, there are three which observers from the old world are apt to think grave beyond all others. These three are the attitude and demands of the labor party, the power which the suffrage vests in recent immigrants from the least civilized parts of Europe, and the position of the colored population at the South. And of these three, the last, if not the most urgent, is the most serious, the one whose roots lie deepest, and which is most likely to stand a source of anxiety, perhaps of danger, for generations to come. Compared with it, those tariff questions and currency questions and railway questions with which politicians busy themselves sink almost to insignificance. It is a large and complicated problem: nor can I, in the few pages which the editor of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW asks me to devote to it, attempt more than to sketch briefly some of the salient features which it presents to a European who revisits the South after an interval of seven years, and who, while knowing far less of the details than well-informed Americans know, has the advantage of being free from sectional feeling or political prepossession.

Copyright, 1891, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

Let us see what are the broad facts of the position as it stands to-day at the South.

The total population of the sixteen States in which slavery existed up to the Civil War, together with Kansas and the District of Columbia, is now 23,875,259, of whom 16,868,305 are white and 6,996,166 colored. In the Gulf States, together with Arkansas and South Carolina, there are 4,519,005 colored, against 6,139,295 white. In three States, South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana, the colored people are in a majority over the whites (2,003,116, against 1,552,869), while in the more northerly and hilly States, such as West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, the whites greatly outnumber the colored. A comparison of the last few censuses shows that the colored population is gradually shifting from the higher and colder regions to the hot semi-tropical lands that border on the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. It is an even more important fact that the rate of increase of the colored population appears by the census of 1890 to be much lower than that of the whites. In the above sixteen States the white rate of increase from 1880 to 1890 was 24.67 per cent.; colored rate, only 13.90 per cent. In the above eight States the white rate was 29.63 per cent.; colored, 19.10 per cent. In South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana the white rate was 17.24 per cent.; colored, 15.31 per cent. Although, therefore, the colored race grows, it grows only in regions to which it is climatically adapted, and it grows, except in a few places, much more slowly than the white race. Time is on the side of the latter.

Both in the middle Southern and in the semi-tropical States, and alike in the cities and in the rural districts, the colored people form the lower stratum of the population. In the lower and hotter parts of the Gulf States and of South Carolina they do all the field work; in the cities and in the mining and manufacturing regions their labor is almost entirely (though less so from year to year) unskilled labor. Very different descriptions of their condition, especially in the agricultural districts, are given by different observers. But two facts stand out. The one is that few, in proportion to the total number, have acquired wealth by commerce, or have risen to any sort of eminence in the professions. The other is that, unlike the negroes of the West India islands, they are generally industrious, working pretty

steadily, whether as hired laborers or as the tenants of small farms, and that they are, though no doubt by slow degrees, learning thrift and self-control.

When it is remembered that the grandparents or great-grandparents of many of them were African savages, — for the importation of slaves was not forbidden till 1808, — we must not be surprised that large masses, especially in Louisiana and Mississippi, remain at a low level of intelligence and morality, with rudimentary notions of comfort and still dominated by gross superstitions. Still less is it strange, considering that only twenty-five years have passed since they were slaves,—slaves to whom it was an offence to teach reading, — that the great majority should lack even the elements of education. So far from finding these facts discouraging, he who travels through the South now is surprised at the progress that has been made since 1865. History and science tell us that social and moral advancement is an extremely slow process, because it issues from a change in the physical as well as mental nature of a race. Compare the negroes even of the semi-tropical States with the negroes of the coast of Guinea or the lower Congo or of Hayti, and the advancement is undeniable. Something may be ascribed to the difference of climate, which makes labor both easier and more necessary; but much is also due to the influence of the white people and, indirectly, to the spirit and tendency of American institutions. The best proof of progress is the fact that the negroes have begun to help themselves; that they are supporting their own churches and schools more liberally, organizing charitable societies for their own benefit, showing an increased desire for education, and profiting by it. They have proved the truth of the converse proposition to Homer's famous saying that a man loses half his worth when he is enslaved. Freedom has done for them in twenty-six years more than any one who knew how slavery left them had a right to expect.

One thing, however, freedom has not done. It has not brought the colored people any nearer to the whites. Social intercourse is strictly confined to business, unless where the negro is a domestic servant; and is far less frequent and easy than in the days of slavery. Then in the home establishment and on the best plantations—plantations like that Dabney estate in Mississippi of which so pleasing a picture was lately given in Mrs. Smedes's

book—even the field hands were on familiar terms with the master and mistress, while the children of both colors played together. This has entirely ceased. In some States the negro is allowed to enter the same street-cars or railroad cars; in some he is less rigidly than in others kept apart in places of public resort. But everywhere in the South he is confined to schools and colleges for his own race; he worships in his own churches; he mingles in none of the amusements, he is admitted to none of the social or industrial organizations, which white people, even the humblest of them, enjoy or form. Most significant of all, his blood is never mixed with theirs. The intermarriage of the races is forbidden by law in all or nearly all* the Southern States, as well as in some Western States; but legal prohibition was scarcely needed, for public sentiment is universally opposed to such unions. Those illicit relations of white men with colored women which were not uncommon in the days of slavery have almost wholly disappeared; and it is now a rare thing for a child to be born with parents of different colors. No intermediate race grows up to link the other two together; for, though there are mulattoes and quadroons, born under the old state of things, they are all reckoned with the negroes.

This social separation does not spring from nor imply any enmity between the races. The attitude of the richer and more educated whites in the South is distinctly friendly to the negro. They like him for his many amiable qualities; and they remember that, when during the Civil War all the men fit to bear arms had gone off to fight the North, the white women and children, left unprotected behind upon the plantations, dwelt in perfect safety, with not even an insulting word to fear. The lower class of whites have somewhat less kindly feelings. The negroes used formerly to despise those whom they called "poor white trash"; and the poor whites, in their turn, were all the more proud of their skin because they had little else to be proud of. In the cities and mining districts the white laborer feels some jealousy of the negro, and is anxious to assert his superiority. Yet, even in these humbler ranks, it would be incorrect to speak of hostility. There is a strong feeling of separation, but there is also a desire to live peaceably and amicably together. Negroes are sometimes

* Mr. F. J. Stimson's valuable book, "American Statute Law," mentions such prohibitions in every Southern State except Louisiana. Whether such an enactment now exists there I am unable at this writing to ascertain.

lynched or shot by individual whites whom they have offended. But in the wilder parts of the South and West whites also are lynched, and though less frequently than negroes, yet sometimes with circumstances of barbarity.* Allowing for the lawlessness which prevails in the more backward districts, for the tendency to cruelty which the sense of power creates, and for the habits formed in Ku Klux days, the negro fares better than might have been expected. But race prejudice is very strong—far stronger than in the British or Spanish West Indies. It shows no signs of declining; it is unaffected by the merits of the individual. A negro who gains wealth or wins for himself a good position in the profession of medicine or law or teaching is no nearer to social equality than a negro blacking boots in the street; and this remark applies to the Northern as well as to the Southern States.

As regards civil rights, those rights of the citizen which the law gives and protects, equality is complete in the public as well as in the private sphere. The negro has not only the suffrage on the same terms as the white, but he has the same eligibility to every kind of office, State office equally with federal office. But although this equality has existed on paper for more than twenty years, the benefits which it has actually secured to the colored people have been so small that one may doubt whether they have substantially gained by those famous amendments of the federal constitution which secure these active civil rights. Since the carpet-bag governments fell, during the years between 1870 and 1876, few indeed have been the negroes who have been elected or appointed to any but the very humblest offices. Although they form in some States one-third, in others one-half or more, of the population, they are seldom elected to a State legislature, or to any post of consequence in State or city government.

It is the same with federal offices. Even the party which gave the negro civil rights, and has ever since advocated his cause, scarcely recognizes him for appointments. This may be explained or excused on the ground that so few negroes have the education required for the better sort of offices, though education is little enough regarded where the services of a white partisan have to be rewarded. It is the same at the North as at the South, although the much smaller proportion of negroes to the popula-

* There was a case some few months ago in which a white woman was flogged to death in the mountains of Tennessee.

tion makes the contrast between what is legally permitted and what is actually enjoyed less striking. The Northern people seem just as unwilling as the Southern people to have a negro set in a post of authority over them. In this exclusion, however, there is no legal wrong to any one. Being everywhere more influential, and in all States but three more numerous, the whites are entitled to prefer candidates of their own color.

It is otherwise as regards the exercise of the electoral suffrage. In the more northerly of the old slave States, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, the negroes are everywhere in such a minority as to cause no apprehension; and in these States, therefore, they can cast their ballot freely, like other citizens, and are said to use even more freely than other citizens the privilege of getting something for it. But in most of the Southern States, though less so in Virginia, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Texas than in the States which have the largest colored population, their vote is very largely suppressed. In the days between 1870 and 1880 this suppression was mostly effected by violence, the negroes being driven or frightened from the polls or maltreated at the polls in one of the ways to which the name "bulldozing" has been applied. Latterly gentler methods have prevailed. Sometimes fraud is used in taking or counting the ballots. Sometimes ingenious and technically legitimate devices, like the Eight-Box Law of South Carolina, are resorted to. Sometimes the well-grounded belief of the colored voters that in some way or other their votes will not be allowed to take effect is enough to prevent them from coming to vote at all.

There are no doubt districts, in some even of the Gulf States many districts, where neither force nor fraud is employed. There are minor elections in which it is not thought needful to interfere with the natural course of things. But, speaking generally, the fact is too well known to need either proof or illustration that over large areas and in really important elections, such as those for Congressmen and for Presidential electors, the colored people are not suffered to use the rights which the amendments to the constitution were intended to secure. One of the ablest and most influential men in the South, now unhappily lost to it, said to me in 1881: "Do not mistake our position. We know the negro and we like him. We are treating him well, and

we mean to treat him well. But we vote him, and we must vote him." These words fairly describe the facts, and fairly express the mind of the Southern people. They are as true now as they were ten years ago.

The problems which this statement of the position suggests may be reduced to three :—

First—How is the negro to be elevated? The English who settled North America have had two lower races to deal with. One they have extruded from his ancient seats. The other they brought from his native continent to serve them. The African has now so multiplied that their interests no less than their duty oblige them to labor for his well-being. If he remains ignorant, uncultured, swayed by passion rather than by reason, he cannot but be a source of danger, as well as a reproach to Christian civilization.

Secondly—How is the social antagonism between the races to be lessened? That it is not prescribed by a law of nature appears from the fact that there are places where it is, if not wholly absent, yet far less strong and far less palpably obtrusive than in the United States. Of social equality I do not speak; but the sharp and harsh social separation which now exists is fraught with trouble, and may become dangerous when the weaker race has grown in intelligence and courage.

Thirdly—How are the anomalies and contradictions of the political position to be overcome? The negroes have got the suffrage, which in America is the source of all power. But the vast majority of them are confessedly unfit for the suffrage. It has been solemnly guaranteed to them by the constitution; and they are not suffered to enjoy it. Such a situation has more than one element of evil in it. It is a standing breach of the constitution, a standing violation of that respect for law which is the very life-blood of democratic institutions. It is calculated to provoke resentment and disaffection on the part of more than seven millions of people. It suspends the natural growth and play of political parties at the South, forcing the negroes to stick to one national party, irrespective of the (often far more important) local issues which State politics present; forcing the Southern whites also to hold together as one party upon one issue, instead of dividing and regrouping themselves according to the questions which the changing conditions of their country bring from time to time to the front. Thus it perpetuates sectional-

ism, a grave mischief in national politics, even though the danger of another secession may have wholly passed away. And last of all, perhaps worst of all, it accustoms the Southern politicians, among whom elections were at one time purer than in the Northern cities, to a course of fraudulent evasions or perversions of the law and of good faith which cannot but distort their own political conscience and undermine that citadel of free government, faith in the elective system and obedience to the decision of the majority. If voting ceases to be honestly managed, people will cease to respect the results of a vote, and the community is thrown back to the old régime of brute force.

To describe thus in these strong terms the shadow which the political side of the negro problem throws over the South is not, I think, to deepen that shadow unduly. Many dispassionate observers use words even stronger. "It may have been a blunder to confer the suffrage on the negroes," such an observer will answer when the history of the matter has been pressed on him. "Probably it was a mistake. But to deprive the negro of it by force or fraud when the constitution has given it to him is an offence which must, if it continues, permanently injure not only the political character of the South, but the constitution and government of the republic itself." That there is some truth in this view sensible Southerners admit. But, as they remark, it does not follow that the proper remedy is to proceed at once to secure for the negro the actual enjoyment of his chartered rights. There are features in the case which must be regarded before adopting so apparently simple a solution of the problem.

One of these features is the unfitness of nine-tenths of the colored people for the privilege which has been thrust upon them. The fifteenth amendment was a hasty and desperate remedy for evils which, crying as they were, might probably have been gradually removed in a less rude and drastic way. The favorite democratic dogma that the gift of a right carries with it the capacity to exercise that right has enough truth to tempt enthusiasts to apply it rashly. No application was ever so extreme as the enfranchisement of the five-years' freedmen of the South, a mass of people not merely ignorant, but destitute of the very rudiments of political aptitude. Children of ten would have been fitter for such an experiment. What wonder that they remain unfit now? The peoples of western Europe, peoples nat-

urally far more gifted, as their primitive literatures prove, have been played upon for some two thousand years by various civilizing influences, and have had many centuries of experience in the arts of government. As we all know, large sections of their populations are to-day scarcely fit for electoral rights. But it is little more than a century (if we strike an average between the earlier and later importations) since the negro of west Africa came in contact with civilized man; only a quarter of a century since he was made a legal person capable of holding even private civil rights.

But the matter is more serious, in the eyes of Southern whites, than this general statement of unfitness conveys. The unfitness of the negro was demonstrated on a colossal scale and with ruinous results in the reconstruction period, when his vote, manipulated by the so-called white carpet-baggers, ruled the States that had seceded, placed unscrupulous adventurers in the highest posts, wasted the public revenues, piled up stupendous fabrics of State debt. The whites cannot forget that dismal period; and their recollection of it makes them vehemently resolute that power shall never again pass into the hands which so misused it. It is not revenge, it is not hatred, it is the instinct of self-preservation, which governs them; an instinct which soon affects Northern men who settle in the South, and which (I strongly suspect) is not without its influence even upon men living in the North who invest their capital in Southern undertakings. This anxiety to prevent the negro from making the force of his vote felt in elections may seem overstrained, and even morbid, to an outside observer who notes the vast superiority of the whites in wealth, intelligence, and the power of organization. But he is forced to admit that both it, and the social separation which keeps the races more widely apart now than they were in the days of slavery, are natural results of the days of carpet-bag rule.

A third feature of the situation is the fact that the great bulk of the negroes have not hitherto valued the suffrage, and do not greatly resent being virtually deprived of it. It must be remembered that there are among the colored people not only different classes, but different races, some of which are greatly below others in intelligence and capacity for progress. The majority to whom I refer, most of them from the Guinea coast, are not only ignorant, but at the same time sluggish and volatile. They

know too little and care too little about politics to have the same sense of injustice and loss which any mass of white men, even the poorest and most ignorant, would feel in the United States. They were not individually better off when they did enjoy the right of voting and ruled their respective States by means of it. Though ready to support the Republican ticket when roused, especially by their preachers, they have no settled, abiding purpose of asserting themselves. The comparatively small minority of educated and property-owning colored people suffer less in their own persons, because they are less frequently interrupted in going to the polls. There are no doubt those who do complain warmly of the wrong practised on their brethren, and sometimes talk of taking action about it. Yet among them one finds not a few who recognize the hard facts of the case, who see that their race needs moral progress rather than political power, who perceive that they and their brethren might suffer more from any increase of irritation on the part of the whites than they would gain by a forcible assertion of their rights even under the protection of the federal government. There are also many whose aspirations lie entirely in the direction of material progress. They wish to improve their own position, and know that political agitation will do nothing for them. There is, I think, more active indignation among the colored people in the Middle and Northern States at the injustice suffered by their race in the Gulf States than exists in those States themselves; and there is also more resentment at the very scanty share in federal offices which the colored people receive.

This is a fact that makes for peace and good feeling. It may be thought to reduce materially the element of political danger in the situation. But it must be remembered, on the other hand, that education is making way everywhere among the negroes, even among the half-barbarous masses that inhabit the lowlands along the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico. Before long the influence of newspapers may be far greater than it now is. The number of well-educated men of color, men who have had a college course and who will feel more acutely than the ignorant the social ban that rests upon them, increases fast. Education at a certain stage brings risks with it. Says Bishop Atticus G. Haygood, than whom the colored people have no better friend:

"In his educational development the negro is just now at the danger-line,

—of which he, most of all, is unconscious. So far his education has developed wants faster than his ability to satisfy them. In the most of them the result is discontent; with many, unhappiness; in some, a sort of desperation; in not a few, dishonesty. . . . This state of things grows out of a natural and universal law of humanity; and is peculiar to the American negro because he is now, and by no fault or choice of his, in this crisis of development. The poorest people are not those who have little, but those who want more than they can readily earn. That many half-taught and unwisely-taught negroes go to the bad is not surprising. In these matters the negro's weakness illustrates his brotherhood to his white neighbors. The prisons show enough half-educated white people to prove that merely learning the rudiments does not secure virtue. In all races it is true that with new knowledge new temptations come: strength to resist comes after, if at all. In all this a man of sense finds no argument against the education of the negro, but a demonstration of the need, for him and for the white race, of more and better education."

This class of half-educated colored people, who can read, but have not yet learned to think, and are beginning to be averse to manual labor, increases daily, while the generation which had the deference, and often the affection, of the slave to his master, will soon have passed away. It is, therefore, possible that the problem may within the next twenty or thirty years enter into a phase more threatening than the present.

Even as it stands, however, there is much to disquiet the men of the South who are most directly affected; much to make the men of the North desire the removal of a state of things which interferes prejudicially with the natural course of national politics. Many are the solutions that have been proposed; some too bold and sweeping to come within the range of practical statesmanship; some too obviously slight and partial to deserve discussion. Space permits me to advert to two or three only.

One, less frequently advocated now than formerly, is the mixture of the two races by intermarriage. Of this it is enough to say that, while the negroes do not desire it, the whites detest it, and that not less in the Northern than in the Southern States. Even in commonwealths where mixed marriages are lawful they are extremely rare, and are visited with the severest social reprobation. Nor is this feeling unreasonable. So far as one can conjecture, the white race would lose more by what is called "miscegenation" than the negro would gain. Civilization would be thrown back. Parts of the country in which the white race had become thoroughly mingled with the black would be out of accord with those where the whites had remained distinct.

Scarcely less impracticable is the plan which seeks to get rid of the negro question by getting rid of the negro—that is to say, by transporting him from America back to his own continent. A large undertaking, indeed, to take seven millions of people, who might have grown to eight or nine before the operation had been completed, uproot them from their homes, and "dump them down," like so much slag from a furnace, in an already populated country, where the appliances of civilization exist in the scantiest measure. The negroes, even those among them who complain of their treatment in the United States, have never shown any wish to leave the territory of the republic. Some of them go West, like the whites, from the older South to Texas or Kansas or southern California. Few or none emigrate either to Africa or to South America, which has been suggested as an alternative place of expatriation. If they were all expelled from the United States, it would be necessary to prevent their return by laws even stricter than those directed against the Chinese, coupled with a severe transport system.

Moreover, the Southern whites, uneasy as they are in States like South Carolina and Mississippi, would not wish to lose this vast body of workers, who cultivate the soil of regions where white labor cannot contend with heat and malaria. There are no doubt many districts formerly tilled by slaves in which white farmers have now begun to establish themselves; and wherever white labor can fairly compete with black, the former is found to be more productive. But there are also extensive hot lowlands into which it would be necessary to bring coolies from India to raise cotton, rice, and sugar, were the negro population withdrawn. Although, therefore, this solution has been recently advocated by some able writers, it seems to be decisively condemned by considerations of humanity and of economics, as well as by the immense practical difficulties which would surround its execution.

The proposal that the whole nation, which gave the suffrage to the colored race by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the constitution, should undertake to protect them in its exercise by the intervention of the national government, deserves a somewhat fuller discussion. It was lately embodied in a bill laid before Congress by an able and rising statesman, one of the foremost men in his party. As everybody knows, the other party

alleged that the measure was prompted, not by sympathy for the negro, but by a desire to reap the full benefit of his vote at congressional and presidential elections. Those, it was said, who enfranchised the negro in the reconstruction period, having now found that the only result of that enfranchisement has been to make the representation of the South larger as against themselves,—since the negro vote, though in fact suppressed, increases that representation,—are now resolved at all hazards to recapture some of those States and districts which it was their aim in 1870 to keep forever attached to themselves. A European observer need not inquire what basis there may be for this charge. It is enough for him to remark that, even were it well founded, it would not affect the merits of the proposal to protect the negro voter by conducting national elections under the authority of the national government. There is a very strong presumption in favor of enforcing a law which actually exists. Under the constitution the negro has the suffrage. He is—this nobody denies—in many districts practically excluded from the enjoyment of it. Two courses are open. If the law cannot be enforced, it ought to be repealed. If it cannot be repealed, it ought to be enforced. No one supposes it can be repealed. Those, therefore, who advocate its enforcement by that very authority which made it have a weighty *primâ-facie* case. Whatever may be their secret motives, they come forward as the protectors and vindicators of law, of orderly government, of democratic principles.

The first argument used against this proposal was that it would be unconstitutional—a point which cannot profitably be discussed here, though one may observe in passing that, while the federal control of elections would depart pretty widely from previous usage and from what may be (somewhat vaguely) called the general conventions and tendency of the constitution, most lawyers would be inclined to think that the letter of the constitution covers it. But there are practical objections of undeniable weight. One of these is that such a remedy would be but partial, since it could not extend to protect the negro in State elections. Another is that it might lead to breaches of the peace and even to conflicts between federal troops and an angry population—conflicts whose results in accentuating sectional feeling must be disastrous. Whether or no things would go so far as this, no one who travels through the South can doubt that the interference

of the federal power would exasperate men's minds. It would be resented both as interference with State rights and as the act of a hostile majority acting in its own party interests. It might stop, or at least greatly retard, the progress of the colored people by inflaming white feeling and by disposing the whites to withhold those large sums which they now vote for negro education. It would certainly intensify race antagonism and social divergence, so that one is not surprised to hear that many thoughtful negroes believe their own people would lose in the social sphere more than they could gain in the political, and declare that the irritation of Southern sentiment against them would outweigh any benefit to be expected from the strict enforcement of their legal rights.

A stranger who seeks to examine the proposed measure by the light of American history and European experience will be apt to think that it is an attempt to overcome nature by force of law. The negroes have been unable to protect themselves in the exercise of the suffrage because they are naturally inferior to the whites—inferior in intelligence, in tenacity, in courage, in the power of organization and cohesion. This inferiority was forgotten or disregarded by those who gave them the suffrage. But it made itself painfully felt, first in the badness of the State governments which the negro vote supported, next in the collapse of those governments, and in the ease with which the whites have been able to dominate ever since. Power naturally falls in a community to the strongest, and law undertakes a tremendous task when it attempts not merely to protect the ordinary civil rights of a backward race, but actually to force the rod of authority into their feeble grasp. It is true that all that federal legislation and federal troops could secure would be the full delivery of the colored vote at federal elections; not also at State elections. Further they could not go. This, however, is regarded by the South as virtually tantamount to an attempt to reëstablish negro ascendency, would be resented accordingly, and would more than ever stimulate the naturally stronger race to crush, in whatever way remained open to it, the naturally weaker.

If the nation refuses to take active steps to protect the negro in the exercise of his political rights, might it not fall back upon the other alternative and withdraw those rights themselves, altering the constitution so as to permit States to discriminate against citizens on the ground of color? It might; but no one supposes

for a moment that it ever will; not only because the feeling against such a change in the constitution would be highly unpopular, but because even those who might desire it for political reasons would think it unadvisable on social grounds, as tending to degrade the colored man, purely and simply as a colored man, below the rest of the community. The same objection would not, however, apply to a scheme which should exclude from the suffrage the ignorant mass of negro population, not on the ground of color, but by the action of an educational qualification. There is nothing in the federal constitution to forbid the enactment of such a provision, which actually exists in a few of the Northern States already (though it does not seem to be rigidly enforced). Each State is perfectly free to restrict the electoral franchise in any way it pleases, so long as the restriction is not based on "race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

The advantages of dealing with the problem by this method are obvious. It admits of variations in different States, and would, even if enacted in the same form by different States, operate differently according to the degree in which education had advanced in each particular State. In Maryland, for instance, or Kentucky, it would exclude a smaller proportion of the colored population than in South Carolina, where illiteracy is more general. It would stimulate the desire of the negroes to acquire knowledge. It would cast no slur upon them as a race, and would not wear the aspect of a retrogression from the generous—perhaps too generous—policy of the period which followed the Civil War. It would spring from, and would conform to, the real character of the difficulty in which the Southern States find themselves. That difficulty arises from the fact, not that colored men can vote, but that the majority of the colored voters are not capable voters, competent for the active functions of citizenship. To deprive the educated and intelligent minority of colored men of these functions would be not only an injustice to them, but a source of evil to the community, for it would increase their discontent, and destroy their attachment to American institutions. But the exclusion of the incompetent on the ground of personal incompetency need excite no resentment, and would probably be followed by the discontinuance of the present artifices practised against colored voters. An outside observer may even think that the precedent of a discriminative suffrage law, withholding a

share in government from those still unfit to use it, would be a valuable one for the whole country. The desirability of universal suffrage, for whites, has been exalted in America to the rank of an axiomatic truth, and applied with hasty confidence. Nothing can be plainer than the mischief it is working in those parts of the Union which receive swarms of ignorant immigrants from the most backward populations of Europe. If the introduction of qualifications for the suffrage in the South should lead some of the Northern and Middle States to reconsider the above-mentioned dogma, and to withhold the means of injuring the commonwealth from new comers unfit to vote intelligently, whether through their general political incompetence or owing to their ignorance of the English language and of American institutions, a service of no small consequence would have been rendered.

There are, however, two considerations which have deterred the States of the South from what might otherwise seem the obviously right course. One is the fact that in lessening the total number of their voters they would lessen their representation in Congress, and therewith their weight in presidential elections. This is just the kind of motive which, though philosophers may condemn it, tells powerfully with practical politicians. The other is the case of the poor whites of the South. There is still much illiteracy among them; far less, to be sure, than among the negroes, but enough in nearly all the States to swell to many thousands the number whom a really effective educational qualification would exclude. It is an unpopular thing to propose to these illiterate voters, some of them, though illiterate, not politically incompetent, that they should disfranchise themselves. Many of them would rather continue to exclude the negro by illegitimate devices than purchase his exclusion by the surrender of their own privileges. However, the State of Mississippi has in its new constitution, adopted in 1890, moved in this direction. It is a State in which there is a huge negro population (747,720, against 539,703 whites), and where, therefore, some action was called for. Here are the provisions bearing on the subject:

Section 241 enacts that every male inhabitant who has resided for two years in the State and one year (or, if he be a minister of the gospel, six months) in the election district, and has paid all his taxes for the two preceding years, shall have the right of vot-

ing. A previous section imposes a poll-tax of $2 (to be applied to the support of the common schools) upon all male inhabitants. Section 244 enacts as follows :

> "Every elector shall, in addition, be able to read any section of the constitution of this State, or he shall be able to understand the same when read to him, or give a reasonable interpretation thereof."

This curious provision might, no doubt, be so administered by a perfectly upright and impartial authority as to admit substantially competent and exclude substantially incompetent persons, irrespective of color. But it has a suspicious air. One may conjecture that a white official will be more readily satisfied with the "reasonable interpretation" which a brother white gives of some section, say this section, of the constitution, than with the explanation tendered by a negro applicant. Such discrimination will be all the easier because illiterate whites will as a rule understand the matter better than illiterate negroes. However, even if the section is so worked as to disfranchise most of the negroes and hardly any of the whites, it is perhaps better that the disfranchisement should take place in this form than by bulldozing or fraudulent counts.

Of the solutions of the political side of the negro question which I have rapidly reviewed, the last will probably be deemed by unprejudiced minds the most simple, natural, and pacific. If an educational or a property qualification, or a combination of both kinds of qualification, were honestly and fairly put in force at the South, both the sense of wrong among the negroes and the sense of danger among the whites would be removed, while the bad habit of tampering with the ballot-box would disappear. Many of the wisest men in the South desire such a solution, and think it not unattainable. They recognize, however, the great obstacles which the illiteracy of a part of the poor white population interposes.

Supposing that these obstacles should prove insuperable, and assuming, as one may safely assume, that neither the commixture of the two races nor the elimination of the negro by removal to Africa can be carried out, the question remains whether the federal power must intervene, or whether it will be better to let things take their natural course. It is from no blindness to the evils of the situation as it stands, nor from any want of sympathy with the negro, that I conceive the latter policy to be the safer

one. The maxim that the physician who doubts whether to administer a drug or not had better refrain, is applicable to legislative interference. Where the reasons for and against such interference are nearly balanced, where success, though possible, is quite uncertain, non-interference is to be preferred, because in politics as in the human body, there is a tendency similar to that which used to be called the *vis medicatrix naturæ*. Things find their level and readjust themselves according to their natural affinities and the balance of actual forces, not, perhaps, in the best way, but in a way which has elements of stability. The reconstructors after the war disregarded the balance of the local forces they found in the South, too readily believing that federal law would prevail against the purposes or passions of the whites. Events have proved that they erred; and another error of the same kind might turn out as ill.

To one who travels through the South, that which seems most needed is the allaying of alarms, the appeasement of irritation, the supersession by other political questions of that constant recurrence to the negro difficulty which harasses men's minds. Could these alarms be removed, and were the negro left to acquiesce in his present exclusion as a temporary evil, which would vanish in a quieter time, things would steadily improve. When he ceased to attempt assertions of his power, the whites would desist from the acts by which his vote is now nullified. Such negroes (chiefly the intelligent townsfolk) as did vote would no longer vote in a compact body, but would divide according to their proclivities on the particular issue of the moment. Their votes would come to be courted by the white parties; and those parties would in time form and shape themselves without a constant and dominating reference to the negro question. If a stranger may venture to express his view on a point of domestic politics, I would say that the solidity of the South, so displeasing to many at the North, is more likely to be broken up by letting the negro alone than by agitating for his protection.

Patience and inaction are distasteful to men who feel, as many friends of the negro do feel keenly, the hardships of his position. But the situation has elements of hope in it. The South is changing in many ways. I do not refer to the latest political developments there, and particularly to the Farmers' Alliance party, for a party which represents the less cultivated sections

of Southern society may prove to have as kindly feelings towards the negro as the older aristocracy of the South has shown. The lynching and other acts of violence which take place now are the work of the poor whites far more frequently than of the descendants of slave-owners. I speak rather of the economic changes that are in progress, of the enormous development of mining and manufacturing industries in large areas in the western parts of Virginia and North Carolina, in eastern Kentucky and eastern Tennessee, in northern Georgia and northern Alabama. New cities are rising, new industries are springing up, workpeople as well as employers are flowing in from the Northern and Middle States; many of the old Southern families are recovering from the losses of the war time; there is a general air of stir and movement and prosperity through tracts where twenty years ago land was not worth the clearing. This prosperity has not merely created new commercial ties between the South and the North, stimulated the growth of the white population in several States, and brought a new civilizing influence to bear upon the negroes. It has also given a new turn to the thoughts of Southern men, made them more eager and more energetic, opened up a new vista of material and social development. People are usually good-natured when they are prosperous, and are more apt to take a sanguine view of their position. Even the negro difficulty will, after another twenty years of such prosperity as these parts of the South seem likely to enjoy, look far less formidable. It will not fill everybody's thoughts as it does now. The negro will be regarded more as a useful reservoir of labor, less as a possible source of danger.

In proving that the colored population grows more slowly than the white, the census just taken has removed another cause of anxiety. It is now clear that the negro, regarded as a factor in the whole community, is becoming relatively far weaker; nor is the process likely to be arrested, because any diminution of the death-rate—now terribly high—would almost certainly be accompanied by a decline in the birth-rate. Taking all these phenomena together, there is good reason to hope that the anxiety with which the whites have regarded the political part of the negro problem may decline; and that as they have less fear of the results of his vote, they will less and less care to interfere with it.

Behind the political problem, however, there stands the further question of the moral and intellectual elevation of the negro, and of his social relations with the whites. Here there is evidently still less room to hope much from legislative interference. Of social equality between the races there is no prospect. The absence of intermarriage and of any wish to intermarry is a serious obstacle to any social intercourse of a familiar and domestic kind. It is, however, possible that easier and more natural relations should spring up; that offences against negroes should be more frequently punished; that the separation enforced in schools and in places of public resort should be less rigid. These improvements, being matters within the sphere of State law, cannot be looked for until public sentiment has begun to change. It is likely to be favorably influenced, not only by the cessation of political alarms, but by the progress of the negro race itself; by its growth in industry and self-control; by the diminution of crime among its ranks.

I am aware that there are those who doubt this progress. To the traveller, however, who compares the South of 1890 with the South of 1883, the evidence seems conclusive that, although in some districts where they live isolated in large masses the negroes, if not relapsing into barbarism, may be standing still, yet over the country at large they are steadily advancing, and advancing by their own exertions as well as by the help of the whites. Thus the signs for the future are on the whole encouraging—encouraging not only as regards the negro himself, but as regards those great commonwealths in which his home lies. The future stages of the problem will be watched with the keenest interest by those who perceive how much its solution may affect the general welfare of the United States and the working-out of the largest scheme of democratic self-government which the world has seen. But although there will be anxiety mingled with this interest, there will be hope also—hope more confident than could have been entertained by any one who saw the South before the war or in the days that immediately followed reconstruction.

JAMES BRYCE.

THE THREE PHILANTHROPISTS.

BY COLONEL ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

I.

"Well, while I am a beggar, I will rail,
And say there is no sin but to be rich."

Mr. A. lived in the kingdom of ———. He was a sincere professional philanthropist. He was absolutely certain that he loved his fellow men, and that his views were humane and scientific. He concluded to turn his attention to taking care of people less fortunate than himself.

With this object in view he investigated the common people that lived about him, and he found that they were extremely ignorant, that many of them seemed to take no particular interest in life or in business, that few of them had any theories of their own, and that, while many had muscle, there was only now and then one who had any mind worth speaking of. Nearly all of them were destitute of ambition. They were satisfied if they got something to eat, a place to sleep, and could now and then indulge in some form of dissipation. They seemed to have great confidence in to-morrow—trusted to luck, and took no thought for the future. Many of them were extravagant, most of them dissipated, and a good many dishonest.

Mr. A. found that many of the husbands not only failed to support their families, but that some of them lived on the labor of their wives; that many of the wives were careless of their obligations, knew nothing about the art of cooking, nothing of keeping house; and that parents, as a general thing, neglected their children or treated them with cruelty. He also found that many of the people were so shiftless that they died of want and exposure.

After having obtained this information Mr. A. made up his mind to do what little he could to better their condition. He petitioned the King to assist him, and asked that he be allowed to take control of five hundred people in consideration that he would pay a certain amount into the treasury of the kingdom. The King, being satisfied that Mr. A. could take care of these people better than they were taking care of themselves, granted the petition.

Mr. A., with the assistance of a few soldiers, took these people from their old homes and haunts to a plantation of his own. He divided them into groups, and over each group placed a superintendent. He made certain rules and regulations for their conduct. They were only compelled to work from twelve to fourteen hours a day, leaving ten hours for sleep and recreation. Good and substantial food was provided. Their houses were comfortable and their clothing sufficient. Their work was laid out from day to day and from month to month, so that they knew exactly what they were to do in each hour of every day. These rules were made for the good of the people, to the end that they might not interfere with each other, that they might attend to their duties, and enjoy themselves in a reasonable way. They were not allowed to waste their time, or to use stimulants or profane language. They were told to be respectful to the superintendents, and especially to Mr. A. ; to be obedient, and, above all, to accept the position in which Providence had placed them, without complaining, and to cheerfully perform their tasks.

Mr. A. had found out all that the five hundred persons had earned the year before they were taken control of by him—just how much they had added to the wealth of the world. He had statistics taken for the year before with great care showing the number of deaths, the cases of sickness and of destitution, the number who had committed suicide, how many had been convicted of crimes and misdemeanors, how many days they had been idle, and how much time and money they had spent in drink and for worthless amusements.

During the first year of their enslavement he kept like statistics. He found that they had earned several times as much ; that there had been no cases of destitution, no drunkenness ; that no crimes had been committed ; that there had been but little sickness, owing to the regular course of their lives ; that few had been

guilty of misdemeanors, owing to the certainty of punishment; and that they had been so watched and superintended that for the most part they had travelled the highway of virtue and industry.

Mr. A. was delighted, and with a vast deal of pride showed these statistics to his friends. He not only demonstrated that the five hundred people were better off than they had been before, but that his own income was very largely increased. He congratulated himself that he had added to the well-being of these people not only, but had laid the foundation of a great fortune for himself. On these facts and these figures he claimed not only to be a philanthropist, but a philosopher; and all the people who had a mind to go into the same business agreed with him.

Some denounced the entire proceeding as unwarranted, as contrary to reason and justice. These insisted that the five hundred people had a right to live in their own way, provided they did not interfere with others; that they had the right to go through the world with little food and with poor clothes, and to live in huts, if such was their choice. But Mr. A. had no trouble in answering these objectors. He insisted that well-being is the only good, and that every human being is under obligation, not only to take care of himself, but to do what little he can towards taking care of others; that where five hundred people neglect to take care of themselves, it is the duty of somebody else, who has more intelligence and more means, to take care of them; that the man who takes five hundred people and improves their condition, gives them on the average better food, better clothes, and keeps them out of mischief, is a benefactor.

"These people," said Mr. A., "were tried. They were found incapable of taking care of themselves. They lacked intelligence, or will, or honesty, or industry, or ambition, or something, so that in the struggle for existence they fell behind, became stragglers, dropped by the wayside, died in gutters; while many were destined to end their days either in dungeons or on scaffolds. Besides all this, they were a nuisance to their prosperous fellow citizens, a perpetual menace to the peace of society. They increased the burden of taxation; they filled the ranks of the criminal classes, they made it necessary to build more jails, to employ more policemen and judges; so that I, by enslaving them, not only assisted them, not only protected them against them-

selves, not only bettered their condition, not only added to the well-being of society at large, but greatly increased my own fortune."

Mr. A. also took the ground that Providence, by giving him superior intelligence, the genius of command, the aptitude for taking charge of others, had made it his duty to exercise these faculties for the well-being of the people and for the glory of God. Mr. A. frequently declared that he was God's steward. He often said he thanked God that he was not governed by a sickly sentiment, but that he was a man of sense, of judgment, of force of character, and that the means employed by him were in accordance with the logic of facts.

Some of the people thus enslaved objected, saying that they had the same right to control themselves that Mr. A. had to control himself. But it only required a little discipline to satisfy them that they were wrong. Some of the people were quite happy, and declared that nothing gave them such perfect contentment as the absence of all responsibility. Mr. A. insisted that all men had not been endowed with the same capacity; that the weak ought to be cared for by the strong; that such was evidently the design of the Creator, and that he intended to do what little he could to carry that design into effect.

Mr. A. was very successful. In a few years he had several thousands of men, women, and children working for him. He amassed a large fortune. He felt that he had been intrusted with this money by Providence. He therefore built several churches, and once in a while gave large sums to societies for the spread of civilization. He passed away regretted by a great many people,—not including those who had lived under his immediate administration. He was buried with great pomp, the King being one of the pall-bearers, and on his tomb was this:

HE WAS THE PROVIDENCE OF THE POOR.

II.

"And, being rich, my virtue then shall be
To say there is no vice but beggary."

Mr. B. did not believe in slavery. He despised the institution with every drop of his blood, and was an advocate of universal

freedom. He held all of the ideas of Mr. A. in supreme contempt, and frequently spent whole evenings in denouncing the inhumanity and injustice of the whole business. He even went so far as to contend that many of A.'s slaves had more intelligence than A. himself, and that, whether they had intelligence or not, they had the right to be free. He insisted that Mr. A.'s philanthrophy was a sham; that he never bought a human being for the purpose of bettering that being's condition; that he went into the business simply to make money for himself; and that his talk about his slaves committing less crime than when they were free was simply to justify the crime committed by himself in enslaving his fellow men.

Mr. B. was a manufacturer, and he employed some five or six thousand men. He used to say that these men were not forced to work for him; that they were at perfect liberty to accept or reject the terms; that, so far as he was concerned, he would just as soon commit larceny or robbery as to force a man to work for him. "Every laborer under my roof," he used to say, "is as free to choose as I am."

Mr. B. believed in absolutely free trade; thought it an outrage to interefere with the free interplay of forces; said that every man should buy, or at least have the privilege of buying, where he could buy cheapest, and should have the privilege of selling where he could get the most. He insisted that a man who has labor to sell has the right to sell it to the best advantage, and that the purchaser has the right to buy it at the lowest price. He did not enslave men—he hired them. Some said that he took advantage of their necessities; but he answered that he created no necessities, that he was not responsible for their condition, that he did not make them poor, that he found them poor and gave them work, and gave them the same wages that he could employ others for. He insisted that he was absolutely just to all; he did not give one man more than another, and he never refused to employ a man on account of the man's religion or politics; all that he did was simply to employ that man if the man wished to be employed, and give him the wages, no more and no less, that some other man of like capacity was willing to work for.

Mr. B. also said that the price of the article manufactured by him fixed the wages of the persons employed, and that he, Mr.

B., was not responsible for the price of the article he manufactured; consequently he was not responsible for the wages of the workmen. He agreed to pay them a certain price, he taking the risk of selling his articles, and he paid them regularly just on the day he agreed to pay them, and if they were not satisfied with the wages, they were at perfect liberty to leave. One of his private sayings was: "The poor ye have always with you." And from this he argued that some men were made poor so that others could be generous. "Take poverty and suffering from the world," he said, "and you destroy sympathy and generosity."

Mr. B. made a large amount of money. Many of his workmen complained that their wages did not allow them to live in comfort. Many had large families, and therefore but little to eat. Some of them lived in crowded rooms. Many of the children were carried off by disease; but Mr. B. took the ground that all these people had the right to go, that he did not force them to remain, that if they were not healthy it was not his fault, and that whenever it pleased Providence to remove a child, or one of the parents, he, Mr. B., was not responsible.

Mr. B. insisted that many of his workmen were extravagant; that they bought things that they did not need; that they wasted in beer and tobacco money that they should save for funerals; that many of them visited places of amusement when they should have been thinking about death, and that others bought toys to please the children when they hardly had bread enough to eat. He felt that he was in no way accountable for this extravagance, nor for the fact that their wages did not give them the necessaries of life, because he not only gave them the same wages that other manufacturers gave, but the same wages that other workmen were willing to work for.

Mr. B. said,—and he always said this as though it ended the argument,—and he generally stood up to say it: "The great law of supply and demand is of divine origin; it is the only law that will work in all possible or conceivable cases; and this law fixes the price of all labor, and from it there is no appeal. If people are not satisfied with the operation of this law, then let them make a new world for themselves."

Some of Mr. B.'s friends reported that on several occasions, forgetting what he had said on others, he did declare that his confidence was somewhat weakened in the law of supply and de-

mand ; but this was only when there seemed to be an over-production of the things he was engaged in manufacturing, and at such times he seemed to doubt the absolute equity of the great law.

Mr. B. made even a larger fortune than Mr. A., because when his workmen got old he did not have to care for them, when they were sick he paid no doctors, and when their children died he bought no coffins. In this way he was relieved of a large part of the expenses that had to be borne by Mr. A. When his workmen became too old, they were sent to the poor-house ; when they were sick, they were assisted by charitable societies ; and when they died, they were buried by pity.

In a few years Mr. B. was the owner of many millions. He also considered himself as one of God's stewards ; felt that Providence had given him the intelligence to combine interests, to carry out great schemes, and that he was specially raised up to give employment to many thousands of people. He often regretted that he could do no more for his laborers without lessening his own profits, or, rather, without lessening his fund for the blessing of mankind—the blessing to begin immediately after his death. He was so anxious to be the providence of posterity that he was sometimes almost heartless in his dealings with contemporaries. He felt that it was necessary for him to be economical, to save every dollar that he could, because in this way he could increase the fund that was finally to bless mankind. He also felt that in this way he could lay the foundations of a permanent fame—that he could build, through his executors, an asylum to be called the "B. Asylum," that he could fill a building with books to be called the "B. Library," and that he could also build and endow an institution of learning to be called the "B. College," and that, in addition, a large amount of money could be given for the purpose of civilizing the citizens of less fortunate countries, to the end that they might become imbued with that spirit of combination and manufacture that results in putting large fortunes in the hands of those who have been selected by Providence, on account of their talents, to make a better distribution of wealth than those who earned it could have done.

Mr. B. spent many thousands of dollars to procure such legislation as would protect him from foreign competition. He did

not believe the law of supply and demand would work when interfered with by manufacturers living in other countries.

Mr. B., like Mr. A., was a man of judgment. He had what is called a level head, was not easily turned aside from his purpose, and felt that he was in accord with the general sentiment of his time. By his own exertions he rose from poverty to wealth. He was born in a hut and died in a palace. He was a patron of art and enriched his walls with the works of the masters. He insisted that others could and should follow his example. For those who failed or refused he had no sympathy. He accounted for their poverty and wretchedness by saying: "These paupers have only themselves to blame." He died without ever having lost a dollar. His funeral was magnificent, and clergymen vied with each other in laudations of the dead. Over his dust rises a monument of marble with the words:

HE LIVED FOR OTHERS.

III.

"But there are men who steal, and vainly try
To gild the crime with pompous charity."

There was another man, Mr. C., who also had the genius for combination. He understood the value of capital, the value of labor; knew exactly how much could be done with machinery; understood the economy of things; knew how to do everything in the easiest and shortest way. And he, too, was a manufacturer and had in his employ many thousands of men, women, and children. He was what is called a visionary, a sentimentalist, rather weak in his will, not very obstinate, had but little egotism; and it never occurred to him that he had been selected by Providence, or any supernatural power, to divide the property of others. It did not seem to him that he had any right to take from other men their labor without giving them a full equivalent. He felt that if he had more intelligence than his fellow men he ought to use that intelligence not only for his own good but for theirs; that he certainly ought not to use it for the purpose of gaining an advantage over those who were his intellectual inferiors. He used to say that a man strong intellectually had no more right to take

advantage of a man weak intellectually than the physically strong had to rob the physically weak.

He also insisted that we should not take advantage of each other's necessities; that you should not ask a drowning man a greater price for lumber than you would if he stood on the shore; that if you took into consideration the necessities of your fellow man, it should be only to lessen the price of that which you would sell to him, not to increase it. He insisted that honest men do not take advantage of their fellows. He was so weak that he had not perfect confidence in the great law of supply and demand as applied to flesh and blood. He took into consideration another law of supply and demand: he knew that the workingman had to be supplied with food, and that his nature demanded something to eat, a house to live in, clothes to wear.

Mr. C. used to think about this law of supply and demand as applicable to individuals. He found that men would work for exceedingly small wages when pressed for the necessaries of life; that under some circumstances they would give their labor for half of what it was worth to the employer, because they were in a position where they must do something for wife or child. He concluded that he had no right to take advantage of the necessities of others, and that he should in the first place honestly find what the work was worth to him, and then give to the man who did the work that amount.

Other manufacturers regarded Mr. C. as substantially insane, while most of his workmen looked upon him as an exceedingly good-natured man, without any particular genius for business. Mr. C., however, cared little about the opinions of others, so long as he maintained his respect for himself.

At the end of the first year he found that he had made a large profit, and thereupon he divided this profit with the people who had earned it. Some of his friends said to him that he ought to endow some public institution; that there should be a college in his native town; but Mr. C. was of such a peculiar turn of mind that he thought justice ought to go before charity, and a little in front of egotism and a desire to immortalize one's self. He said that it seemed to him that of all persons in the world entitled to this profit were the men who had earned it, the men who had made it by their labor, by days of actual toil. He insisted that, as they had earned it, it was really

theirs, and if it was theirs, they should have it and should spend it in their own way.

Mr. C. was told that he would make the workmen in other factories dissatisfied, that other manufacturers would become his enemies, and that his course would scandalize some of the greatest men who had done so much for the civilization of the world and for the spread of intelligence. Mr. C. became extremely unpopular with men of talent, with those who had a genius for business. He, however, pursued his way, and carried on his business with the idea that the men who did the work were entitled to a fair share of the profits; that, after all, money was not as sacred as men, and that the law of supply and demand, as understood, did not apply to flesh and blood.

Mr. C. said: "I cannot be happy if those who work for me are defrauded. If I feel I am taking what belongs to them, then my life becomes miserable. To feel that I have done justice is one of the necessities of my nature. I do not wish to establish colleges. I wish to establish no public institution. My desire is to enable those who work for me to establish a few thousand homes for themselves. My ambition is to enable them to buy the books they really want to read. I do not wish to establish a hospital, but I want to make it possible for my workmen to have the services of the best physicians —physicians of their own choice. It is not for me to take their money and use it for the good of others or for my own glory. It is for me to give what they have earned to them. After I have given them the money that belongs to them, I can give them my advice—I can tell them how I hope they will use it; and after I have advised them, they will use it as they please. You cannot make great men and great women by suppression. Slavery is not the school in which genius is born. Every human being must make his own mistakes for himself, must learn for himself, must have his own experience; and if the world improves, it must be from choice, not from force; and every man who does justice, who sets the example of fair dealing, hastens the coming of universal honesty, of universal civilization."

Mr. C. carried his doctrine out to the fullest extent, honestly and faithfully. When he died, there were at the funeral those who had worked for him, their wives and their children. Their

tears fell upon his grave. They planted flowers and paid to him the tribute of their love. Above his silent dust they erected a monument with this inscription:

HE ALLOWED OTHERS TO LIVE FOR THEMSELVES.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL.

THE BENEFITS OF WAR.

BY REAR-ADMIRAL S. B. LUCE, UNITED STATES NAVY.

WAR is one of the great agencies by which human progress is effected.

Scourge though it be, and much as its practice is to be deplored, we must still recognize war as the operation of the economic laws of nature for the government of the human family. It stimulates national growth, solves otherwise insoluble problems of domestic and political economy, and purges a nation of its humors. According to an ancient proverb, *Purgamenta hujus mundi sunt tria, pestis, bellum, et frateria.*

War is the malady of nations; the disease is terrible while it lasts, but purifying in its results. It tries a nation and chastens it, as sickness or adversity tries and chastens the individual. There is a wisdom that comes only of suffering, whether to the family or to the aggregation of families—the nation. Man is perfected through suffering.

What is true of the average individual is true of the mass of individuals—the people.

Some of the richest contributions to literature, art, and science have been the offsprings of indigence. Want brings out the natural gifts that affluence stifles. So, in the economy of nature, or the providence of God, war is sent, not necessarily for the punishment of national sins, nor yet for national aggrandizement; but, rather, for the forming of national character, the shaping of a people's destiny, and the spreading of civilization.

It is only through long years of severe trials and tribulations that many men and women have been schooled to ultimate success. So nations, before achieving greatness, have had to struggle through periods of bitter strife before the various factions, with their conflicting interests, have been formed into one homogeneous mass.

law of human progress, and of the principles of democracy. The operation of this law is not to be arrested on the hither shores of the Pacific; nor is history to be turned back. The course of empire still holds its accustomed way. With the United States, as the dominant power of the western world, lies the obligation of contributing her share to the further extension of civilization, to the spreading of the gospel, and conveying to less favored nations the most enlightened views of civil government. Peaceful commerce is one of the forces by which this end may be attained; and the Pacific and its further shores the field of its operations. This splendid work our people are now content to leave to England and those most effective missionaries, her military and mercantile marines. The time will come, however, when the nation, in its manhood, will "put away childish things," assume its own high responsibilities, and organize its forces for practical use.

We are far from maintaining that war is the only agency through which the present advanced state of civilization has been reached. Christianity has been, and must continue to be, an indispensable factor. But the sword has ever preceded the banner of the cross. Indeed, Christianity, as we shall see, has often had to work its own way through the instrumentality of the sword.

Commerce is another great factor. By it civilization is carried over wide seas to distant lands; but commerce owes its extension and protection to the military arm of the people it represents.*

Wars have sometimes been precipitated in spite of all human efforts to prevent them. As in the presence of the convulsions of nature man feels his utter nothingness, so in the great political and religious movements which have marked certain epochs in history man has found himself impotent to either control or guide the march of events. It is then that he acknowledges that human affairs are directed by a power above and beyond this world, for the ultimate good of his race. Such was, preëminently, the case in this country in 1861. It was so in England in 1642. That revolution which "taught Englishmen what good government meant," and is part of the history of this country, was the natural

* It seems like uttering a platitude to quote De Tocqueville's remark that "reason and experience prove that no commercial prosperity can be durable if it cannot be united in case of need to naval force." ("Democracy in America.") His prophecy that "America will one day become the first maritime power of the globe—they are born to rule seas, as the Romans were to conquer the world," will doubtless be fulfilled in time.

fruit of the Reformation. It was the first collision between freedom of inquiry and absolute monarchy. In the impulse which was given to human thought, and in the abolition of absolute power in the spiritual order, the Reformation, we are told, accomplished far more than it had undertaken or even dreamed of. It failed to even comprehend the vast extent of its own work. It did not respect the rights of opinion. At the very moment of demanding those rights for itself, it was violating them towards others. Great as its work undoubtedly was, it could be completed only through the agency of the sword.

That protracted and bloody drama, the Thirty Years' War, which in the name of religion devastated and impoverished Germany, saved Protestantism from obliteration, insured religious toleration, and opened the way to the German intellectual life of a later time.

The net results of Napoleon's campaigns were to break up the system of petty states in Germany and Italy, "to reawaken the spirit of inquiry in the people, to sweep away the relics of an effete feudalism, and leave the ground clear for the growth of newer and better forms of political life."

Our own Civil War furnishes as notable an example as may be found in history of the operation of this law of strife by which human progress is effected. War was the only means of solving the great political problem of the abolition of slavery, and the phenomenal progress, not of the South alone, but of the whole country, during the past twenty-five years, bears abundant testimony to the quickening influences of that momentous struggle.

Heaven forbid that we should even seem to be an advocate of war. We are not an advocate of war, nor of pestilence, nor of famine. On the contrary, we join with the church in praying for deliverance from them. But this is not a question of what one could wish: it is a question of a great fundamental truth.

From constantly recurring phenomena of the same class covering periods marked by centuries, and the tendency of the same phenomena at the present time, we are enabled to arrive at certain laws. Thus from the frequency of wars both in ancient and in modern times, even up to the present writing, and from the marked influence those wars have had on national life and character, it is impossible to escape the conviction that they are the results of fixed laws, and not the products of human in-

stitutions established, and admitting of being abolished, by the commonwealth of nations.

Strife in one form or another in the organic world seems to be the law of existence. "Life," the scientist tells us, is but "the sum of all the forces that resist death." Suspend the struggle, well called the battle of life, for a brief space, and death claims the victory. The struggle begins at birth, and ends in one unvarying way at the grave.

In the battle of life there are two distinct lines of operation—that which has to do with physical and that which has to do with moral laws.

In this way it comes that a man finds himself at war first with himself, and then with his neighbor. The supreme law of self-preservation compels a man to obtain his daily bread. Acquisitiveness begets avarice. To save his darling treasure a man will defraud his brother; hence family feuds. From inherent weakness and clashing of opinion there are bitter contentions among churchmen; among congregations and their pastors; among Christian associations of various kinds. Strife is continual and everywhere in this wicked world. In the sublime vision of St. John the Divine, there was war in heaven when the archangel Michael and his legions of angels fought against the dragon, which is the evil one. It was the strife between the principle of good and the principle of evil; and where is that strife maintained but in the human heart? St. James asks of the turbulent Jews of Palestine: "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?" And St. Paul, writing to the Christians in Rome, struck the same keynote of human passions: "I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."

It would be difficult to find in sacred or profane literature a clearer expression than St. Paul's of this fundamental law of human nature. As long as that law remains unchanged, just so long may we look for an inward conflict going on in every human bosom, and the predominance in one individual or another of the principle of good or the principle of evil; and just so long may we look for covetousness and envy, and for dissensions among individuals, communities, and nations.

By the very law of our nature, it thus appears, the well-spring

of war is in the human heart. When the apostle of universal peace can change human nature itself, then may he hope to put an end to war. The utmost that we can now reasonably hope for is to lessen the frequency and the evils of war.

Sadly enough, religious wars are the most relentless; and the darkest and bloodiest pages of history have been recorded in the name of him who taught and practised the divine law of love. And yet, was it not even he who said, "Think not that I am come to send peace, . . . but a sword?"

It has been said that it was one of the greatest reproaches to human nature that wars are sometimes just; and the author of "Gesta Christi" complains that there is "one field where Christianity seems a failure." "War," he says, "still remains the most fearful curse upon mankind." On the same grounds we may regard disease as a reproach to human nature, and charge inadequacy to the Christian religion because we have such dreadful railroad accidents. Christianity, we apprehend, has to do with the regeneration of the human heart, and not with the laws of nature. "Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places." But "be not troubled," said the Holy one of Israel; "for all these things must come to pass." We are told, it is true, that there is a time coming when war shall cease. "Love is the fulfilling of the law," declared our Divine Master. That is to say, when the human heart shall have become regenerate, the prophecy will be fulfilled that the sword, the emblem of war, shall be turned into the ploughshare, the emblem of peace, and spears into reaping-hooks. "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Then that "old serpent which is the devil" shall be bound for a thousand years, and "deceive the nations no more till the thousand years be fulfilled." But Satan, still unbound, ceases not "from going to and fro in the earth and from walking up and down in it," and "deceiving the nations."

Contrary doctrines, founded on denunciations indiscriminately heaped upon the practice of war by various writers at various times, have been frequently expressed in recent years. The late Dr. Francis Wayland, in his "Elements of Moral Science," laid down the broad principle that "all wars are contrary to the revealed will

of God."* Starting with that assumption, it is argued that the law of human progress is leading man to a state of moral perfection on earth; and that, because of the wonderful advances in the arts and sciences which have characterized the age, we must be rapidly approaching that blissful state. Orators find this a popular theme; people like to hear it. But the connection—say, rather, the *dis*connection, or, truer still, the antagonism—between material prosperity and spiritual growth is not made clear.

Of the whole range of sciences, moral science, founded on Christian ethics, on which the attainment of the earthly Eden depends, has made no progress in eighteen hundred years. The principles governing the moral world were laid down by the great founder of our church in the beginning, and left nothing to be said, no improvement to be made. He distinctly stated, moreover, and all his teachings went to show, that his kingdom was not of this world.

Even the preparation for war has been denounced. "From a general comprehension of the war system," said Charles Sumner, —and he has hosts of followers,—"we perceive the unchristian character of the preparations it encourages and requires."† But, according to Moses and the prophets, God himself worked out, through the agency of war, the destiny of his own chosen people. And our Saviour, so far from condemning war, counselled a wise prudence in regard to all worldly affairs. "What king," he asked, after his wonderful manner of conveying lessons of the most profound wisdom,—"What king, going to make war against another king, sitteth not down first, and consulteth whether he be able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and desireth conditions of peace."

It was by war and pestilence that the children of Israel were disciplined. "If ye rebel," was the divine mandate, "ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

*It is only fair to state that during the Civil War Dr. Wayland became convinced of his mistake in this particular. But his work had long been used as a text-book in our schools, and the influence of his erroneous teaching on the subject referred to is still felt.

† Address before the American Peace Society, May 28, 1849, on "True Grandeur of Nations."

Moses, the greatest military leader of ancient times, conducted his campaigns in accordance with the instructions received from God himself. For he had found grace in the sight of the Lord, who spake to him face to face, as a man speaketh to a friend. Deborah, the prophetess, and Barak, son of Abinoam, sang praises to the Lord for their victory over the Canaanites. "They fought from heaven" is their song; "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera." "The Lord is with thee, thou mighty man of valor," is the salutation of the angel to Gideon, as he was threshing wheat. Jephthah, receiving assurances of divine support, went out and defeated the sons of Ammon. Sacred history resounds with the clash of arms and the songs of triumph; and lurid beacon fires, streaming through the soft Syrian nights, frequently call God's people to war. The result of all these conflicts furnishes one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of the human race. From the lowest and most abject state of Egyptian bondage, the children of Israel were trained by war to become a powerful race, to take their stand among the nations of the earth, and give to all succeeding ages, in an imperishable literature, the principles of the highest civilization.

The ancient and "immovable civilization" of China, on the other hand, shows the stagnation of a people unaccustomed to war with a superior race. China, to-day, presents a picture of what the modern world would have been without war.* The rights of man are there unknown.

War is certainly a great evil, and abhorrent to every right-minded person. So is small-pox. But it is not the greatest evil. Milton said, during the Commonwealth, that civil war was not as great an evil as a tyrannical government. "When the devil of tyranny," said he, "hath gone into the body politic, he departs not but with foaming and great convulsions: shall he, therefore, vex it forever, lest in going out he, for a moment, tear and rend it?"

The proper spirit in which to consider a great evil is to look it in the face, examine into its origin, and seek the causes which lead to its production. If these causes lie in the operation of

* The *modern* world. The civilization of China probably represents that of the Chaldeans, of about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, 588 B. C. The wars which China has engaged in with England and with France, while too restricted in their sphere of action to affect the mass of the Chinese people, have undoubtedly had a marked local influence.

the laws of nature, which cannot be influenced by human action, then we must endeavor to modify the effects and ameliorate, as far as lies in our power, the conditions to which they give rise. Man cannot control the meteorological laws which manifest themselves in cyclones; but he can build ships and houses strong enough to withstand their violence. Medical science cannot conquer death, but it has done much to alleviate suffering; and statistics show that the average duration of human life has been increased through increased knowledge of the laws of hygiene. Moral science cannot boast of a like achievement. It has been stated on good authority that, while the population has increased 30 per cent. from 1870 to 1880, the number of criminals in the United States has increased 82.33 per cent. Immorality and crime are on the increase. This fact, coupled with those of the centralization of wealth and the interminable conflict between capital and labor, makes a gloomy outlook for that brotherhood of man which is to form the basis of universal peace.

Questions in medical science are submitted to rigorous investigation according to scientific methods. Questions in moral science are too often treated from a sentimental standpoint, or quietly ignored. Even in this enlightened age we seek to eradicate the "great social evil" by shutting our eyes to it. There is a widespread disposition to treat war in the same way—by shutting the public eye to it. What progress had pathology made by that method?

It is the popular and very proper thing to say that the progressive spirit of the age is leaving the barbarism of war behind, and that as civilization advances it will learn less of war. Arbitration is now the sovereign panacea for that national ill. But, as a matter of fact, war has never been so carefully and so systematically studied as at the present time. The genius of invention has never been so prolific as now in devising and improving implements of war. That man is honored and enriched who contrives means of destroying the greatest number of human beings in the shortest space of time. As the conduct of war becomes more scientific, and the art becomes refined, and the inplements more destructive, the recurrence of war is lessened, the duration shortened, and the loss of human life diminished. This is the direction the spirit of the age is taking—a direction in the interests of humanity.

These humane conditions, however, involve an advanced stage of preparation. As a science war should be sedulously cultivated by the few qualified to undertake it; as an art it should be constantly practised by the entire body set apart for that purpose, and with the implements actually to be used in war. It is to this state of preparation that we owe the peace of Europe to-day. The mere presence of the American army on our southern frontier in 1866 was sufficient to cause the collapse of Louis Napoleon's scheme for a Mexican empire. By a perfect state of preparation a collision of arms was avoided and the shedding of blood spared. To be unprepared is wicked. It invites aggression and a useless effusion of blood. The question of an empire in Mexico supported by French bayonets was not one for arbitration. We simply would not have it.

There is a certain class of international questions for which arbitration is admirably suited; there is another class for which it is not suited at all—for which it is totally inadmissible. It is the lamb that advocates arbitration, even though the life and honor of the fold be involved, while the wolf maintains a lofty indifference to all such methods of proceeding.

Venezuela has been for years past supplicating for arbitration on the question of boundary between her own territory and that claimed by England; but it is only within the last few months that the latter power has, according to report, formally declined the good offices of the United States in that controversy.

Arbitration was inadmissible in 1860—61, when so sorely needed. War, which had been in the course of preparation for thirty years preceding its outbreak, was the only solution of the great problem. It had to be.

Arbitration fails miserably when most needed, and what wonder? The high contracting parties and their umpires are all men of like passions, having no court of last resort but the battle-field.

Every Christian, whatever may be his private convictions, must hope and pray for the success of the Universal Peace Association and the sufficiency of arbitration in all international disputes. But no American, be he Christian or not, should forget the moral effect on negotiations of the propinquity of an adequate force. It was the moral as well as the military effect of a large and victorious army on the Rio Grande that caused the with-

drawal of the French army from Mexico. The hopelessness of a conflict with the veterans who had fought under Grant and Sherman was felt, not only in France, but throughout all Europe, to an extent difficult at this day to realize. But that that moral effect has, during the past quarter of a century, waned away is just as certain as it is that the vast military force which produced it has resolved itself into its original elements of peaceful and industrious citizenship.

The United States are known of all the world to be wanting in the disposition to utilize their abundant resources for military purposes—not with a view to conquest, but even for the defences suggested by the most ordinary prudence. Ready as they are to wage a commercial warfare, our people close their eyes to the possibilities of an actual collision of arms.

There are false prophets who proclaim that war is to be abolished and that preparation for war is a useless extravagance; who offer a cheap nostrum for a dreadful disease. Out of that fearful concatenation of evils set forth in the solemn litany of the Holy Catholic Church of America, wherein we are taught to supplicate deliverance from sin; from the crafts and assaults of the devil; from plague, pestilence, and famine; from battle and murder, and from sudden death, they select battle alone for extirpation. Why should they not include sin as well? Why not include the whole dreadful catalogue? Why not form an association for the suppression of all inordinate and sinful affections?

The truth is that war is an ordinance of God. The flaming sword that guards the way to sinless Eden will continue to prevail, until man enters once more into that peace which passeth all understanding, when the lust of the eye and the pride of life shall no more be known. But mortal man cannot yet discern the coming of that day.

Meanwhile let practical America recognize the truth that war is a calamity that may overtake the most peaceful nation, and that insurance against war by preparation for it is, of all methods, the most business-like, the most humane, and the most in accordance with the teachings of the Christian religion.

S. B. Luce, U. S. N.

A GREAT STATISTICAL INVESTIGATION.

BY THE HON. CARROLL D. WRIGHT, UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

THE Senate of the United States on March 3, 1891, authorized and directed its Committee on Finance to ascertain in every practicable way, and to report from time to time to the Senate, the effect of tariff laws upon the imports and exports, the growth, development, production, and prices of agricultural and manufactured articles at home and abroad; and upon wages, domestic and foreign. The full Committee on Finance consists of Senators Morrill of Vermont, Sherman of Ohio, Jones of Nevada, Allison of Iowa, Aldrich of Rhode Island, Hiscock of New York, Voorhees of Indiana, McPherson of New Jersey, Harris of Tennessee, Vance of North Carolina, and Carlisle of Kentucky. To carry out the instructions of the Senate, a sub-committee, consisting of Senators Aldrich (chairman), Allison of Iowa, Hiscock of New York, Harris of Tennessee, and Carlisle of Kentucky, was selected. Immediately on the adjournment of Congress the sub-committee took up the questions committed to it. The expense of the investigation ordered was to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. Contrary to the popular idea, this contingent fund, instead of being an inexhaustible fund, is only $25,000, from which the expenses of various committees, for whatever purposes they may be acting, and under various resolutions, must be paid.

The vastness of the duties assigned under the resolution referred to was such that the committee could not organize the independent machinery adequate to the proper carrying-out of the instructions of the Senate. There must be special agents, experts, and a considerable clerical force, in order to make even a beginning in the proposed investigation. The officers of the Department of Labor had for some time been paving the way for an

investigation covering wages and prices through a long period of years, and they would have undertaken the collection of the statistics necessary for the work the present year. The Finance Committee, after due consideration of the difficulties in the way of carrying out the provision of the Senate resolution, suggested that the Department of Labor coöperate with its sub-committee in a portion of the work assigned to it. This would enable the two forces to carry on, with the combined means at their disposal, and on an adequate basis, some of the various lines of inquiry indicated by the Senate resolution; the result being that the Senate committee would be able to do much more than it could alone, and the Department of Labor would have the coöperation of the Senate Committee, while the results of the investigation would be as much at the disposal of the department as of the committee, and would be used in the ways that the wisdom of each might indicate. So the Department of Labor was intrusted with the collection of statistics desired by the committee in certain directions, while experts in various other directions were employed directly by the committee.

The necessity for such an investigation as that directed by the Senate is apparent. The great debates in Congress and by the press and in the political campaigns, commencing with that upon the Tariff Bill of 1883, which became the act of March 3, 1883, have bristled with statistics. No speaker in or out of Congress, and no writer, seemed to feel that he was in any adequate measure approaching the leading elements of the tariff discussion unless he introduced more or less of tabular statements to back up the theories propounded. The frantic appeals to all statistical offices for tables showing the prices of commodities through a series of years and in different countries, the rates of wages paid in various industries and at different periods, and the cost of production, were generally met with the statement that Congress had not yet provided for the collection of the statistics demanded.

To be sure, Congress had undertaken to meet the great want relative to the cost of production, the cost of living, wages, and the efficiency of labor in great industries at the present time, in the act approved June 13, 1888, to establish a Department of Labor, wherein it was provided that the Commissioner of Labor should ascertain, at as early a date as possible, the cost of producing articles at the time dutiable in the United States in lead-

ing countries where such articles are produced, by fully specified units of production and under a classification showing the different elements of cost or approximate cost of such articles of production, including the wages paid in such industries, the hours employed, and the comparative cost and the kind of living. This provision of law was immediately carried out by the Commissioner of Labor, and the results on the lines indicated, so far as iron and steel and the cognate industries of ore, coal, coke, and limestone are concerned, have been laid before Congress, while the facts relating to textiles and glass will early in the coming session be transmitted to the President. These facts, supplying one of the great missing links in all debates on the tariff, which have been so freely called for by speakers and writers, will constitute two large volumes, and will answer to a certain extent the necessities of the case; but statistics on wages and prices covering a long period of years, made in such a way that one can ascertain the fluctuations on the same article or in the same occupation, have been wanting.

There have been, it is true, specific and fugitive reports from time to time, emanating from different offices. In the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1849 there are to be found most valuable tables relating to prices, and so in the finance report of 1863, from the Secretary of the Treasury, are to be found quite elaborate tables showing prices of commodities, while the report of the Director of the Mint for the calendar year 1884 added much to the value of statistics of prices by some extended tables. Various reports from different State bureaus of labor have been used in the debates, but all these reports have been too circumscribed in their extent to offer sufficient lines of figures for a comprehensive study of wages and prices. Mr. Joseph D. Weeks, in the XXth volume of the reports on the Tenth Census, covered an exeedingly wide field relative to wages, cost of living, etc., and this report has been used most freely in the great discussions; but it was not the policy of the officers of the Tenth Census to permit any classification or tabulated statement, so that one wishing to use the valuable data of the report was obliged to pick out here and there specific things, from which a fairly connected statement could be made. In the report of the writer on the factory system, which constituted part of Volume II. of the reports on the Tenth Census, there is considerable valuable

information relating to wages in textile factories in the country, not only of the present time, but of the past. But all these different statistical volumes, as I have said, offered only fugitive and fragmentary data, for in no case had a complete compilation been made.

Having provided for the statistics relating to cost of production, the efficiency of labor, etc., through the Department of Labor, the Senate felt that a much broader inquiry should be entered upon. So the Finance Committee, under the resolution which has been mentioned, has undertaken to direct the collection of what may justly be called "missing data." The plan of the committee and the scope of its work offer matters of great interest to a wide class of people—to Senators and Representatives, who are called upon to decide in matters of tariff legislation and in the discussion of bills relating to the currency; to speakers, who are undertaking to show the people the truth as they understand it on the two great sides of these questions; to writers, who are considering the same important themes, and also those relating to the social and material welfare of the people, irrespective of legislation on questions of tariff and finance; to reformers, who have solutions to offer for the multitudinous problems arising under what may be called "the labor question," and, in fact, the whole line of economic questions. It will be seen that any plan must be comprehensive, and that any investigation under a comprehensive plan must be minute and searching. The first desire of the committee was, therefore, to so project its work that it could make a unanimous report as to facts. Could this be done, discussion would be simplified. The committee could not, of course, be expected to make a unanimous report, in all cases, relative to causes or results, but it could, perhaps, by judicious work, be able to agree on the facts themselves; and it is a matter of great congratulation that in all the discussions upon methods, upon lines of inquiry, and upon the practical details of the investigation, the members of the sub-committee have worked with complete harmony. Not a thing has been done that has not been the result of unanimous agreement.

The first effort of the committee was to secure the collection of data relative to retail prices in fairly representative centres, meaning by the latter term cities, industrial centres, and country towns; and it determined to collect the prices of the commodities

that enter into the consumption of the people in seventy places, and for each month from the 1st of June, 1889, to the 1st of September, 1891, inclusive. The articles included in the inquiry were selected by the committee with the view of representing fairly all articles which enter, either directly or indirectly, into the expense of living. For instance, in addition to articles of food and clothing entering directly into the cost of living, they have selected articles of hardware, building materials, etc., which affect, through the cost of building, the cost of rent. In making this list 221 articles were selected. Experts in all directions were consulted as to designations, the effort being to secure such articles and designations of articles as would allow continuous quotations, both as to kind and quality; and while it was not expected that each article designated would be found in each locality selected, it was expected, and the result has satisfied the expectation, that prices would be obtained for *an* article for the whole period which should have a continuous quality.

The field work for this inquiry, comprehending retail prices of articles for the period named and the wages paid in general occupations such as carpentering, masonry, blacksmithing, etc., and the leading factory occupations, or occupations found in great productive works, has been completed. While this incidental work of the committee was going on, it had under consideration the more vital question of the course of prices at wholesale, or, more accurately, the net prices of agents or the prices at first hands of the leading articles of consumption for a long period of years, the period from 1840 to 1891 having been settled upon. Great obstacles at once presented themselves in the collection of the required data in this respect. It was necessary to select articles which could be recognized through this long period, and so manufacturers, wholesale dealers, and experts were called into consultation by the committee. The designation of articles on which quotations are to be secured for a long period is not a simple matter. For instance, a "shovel" in the Eastern States is a "spade" in the Western States, and *vice versâ*; what is meant by this is that the tool called a "shovel," being a short-handled implement, with a square blade and an open place for the hand at the end of the handle, is in the Eastern States called a "shovel," while in many Western localities a long-handled, heart-shaped implement is called a "shovel." This

simply illustrates the difficulty of designating articles by a term which should be recognized throughout the country and throughout the period settled upon; but, after many sittings and much consultation with experts, the committee finally decided upon a very comprehensive list for wholesale prices, and it then selected experts in the great lines, such as the textiles, iron and steel, paints and chemicals, and a few others, to whom was committed the duty of collecting the statistics. These experts are the best-known men in their various lines, and in this feature alone is shown the wisdom of the committee; it has brought into sympathy with it, and into enthusiastic coöperation, men in the great lines of production and trade. Articles not committed to special experts have been committed to the Department of Labor; so that, with the special agents of the department working along with the experts selected by the sub-committee, there is a force engaged in the collection of prices such as has not before been utilized.

The prices at which farmers sell their leading products—that is, the prices received by the farmer at his farm—constitute a very essential feature of the inquiry relative to prices, and especially when such prices are brought into comparison with the wholesale prices of such articles in the great markets.

Not content with securing prices in this country alone, the committee is seeking, for the short period already named, the retail prices in Great Britain, and it has also undertaken the collection of prices at which the leading articles of import are sold in foreign countries.

Another great branch of the inquiry, and one which was contemplated by the Senate resolution of March 3 last, relates to the wages paid in leading occupations in the great industries of the country, and to salaries in some employments, like those of salesmen and teachers, this inquiry covering also the long period from 1840 to 1891. It would be foolish to attempt to collect on any great scale the rates of wages in occupations and subdivisions of occupations as they are known in the manufacturing industries of to-day. The obstacles in the way of the collection of accurate wage statistics are sufficiently great without burdening the duty with a very great number of subdivided occupations. The introduction of machinery has caused many changes in the designations of occupations and employments. Piece-work, time-work, the carrying-on of special features of production through the employ-

ment of what are known as "teams" or "gangs," and many other features of modern production, almost discourage any effort at the collection of wage statistics; but the committee has wisely concluded to ascertain the rates of wages in the general trades and in leading occupations in the great productive industries, hoping thereby to determine, on specific and representative things, the course of the rates of wages and the fluctuations therein. Of course the hours of labor, and the proportional weight of the occupations for which wages will be secured to the whole body of employees in a given establishment, constitute important features of inquiry.

The matters referred to are those of original inquiry from first hands. In addition to these, the committee is collecting from the quartermaster-general's bureau of the War Department the prices paid by the government, on well-known standards, for clothing from 1840 to the present time; from the bureau of the commissary-general the prices paid for articles of food; from the surgeon-general's office the prices paid for drugs, etc., and from the bureau of clothing and provisions of the Navy Department the prices paid by that department for clothing and provisions. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs will furnish, for such period as he is able, the prices which have been paid under his direction for the articles contemplated by law for the Indian service.

The Department of Agriculture has consented to take charge of an important part of the investigation, and will furnish, from original sources and collected data, statistics as to wages of farm labor in all portions of the country, and the prices received for the great farm products for half a century. Great houses, trade associations, and others are coöperating most thoroughly with the committee in connection with these great departments of the government.

In addition to all these sources of information, the committee will gather from all reputable reports of the different States of this country and of the United States Government, and from foreign countries, all legitimate statistics relating to prices and wages. It will be seen at once that the results of such a comprehensive inquiry cannot be other than exceedingly valuable, and, properly classified, arranged, and analyzed, will furnish a body of facts on which there can be little or no debate. All these

data will be examined in the light of the influence of the introduction of new devices and processes in manufacture wherever invention has led to a change in conditions; the introduction of new industries and the time of their introduction, and the demands which led to their establishment being considered in their correlative importance.

After the facts are collected the difficult work of the committee in endeavoring to determine what influence tariff legislation has had upon the results will commence; but it will first ascertain the facts accurately and impartially. It will not deal with the averages in the ordinary way of trade reports on prices in the first instance, but it will utilize the great collections, which are exceedingly valuable in themselves, which have been published from time to time by trade journals. In fact, no source which offers any valuable results will be ignored.

The prices of articles of food, independent of wages paid for labor, would not lead to any very conclusive deductions relative to the cost of living or the consuming power of the people; but, taking both into account, the compensation which labor receives for its efforts and the expense which it must incur for the leading articles of consumption must show, with the other consideration which the committee is giving the subject, the relative conditions of the majority of our population at different periods. Whether and to what extent these conditions have been affected by the tariff legislation since 1840 is a question of philosophical deduction, on which honest men may divide.

It is of the utmost importance at the present time, with the great interest which all people have in economic questions, that the relative comparison of prices of staple commodities and of the earning capacity of the great masses of the population in this and other countries at various dates should be made; but before such comparison can be made there must be the widest collection of data. The committee thoroughly understands the obstacles and difficulties in the way of making such comparisons. It has clearly understood that prices will vary in the same city on several points; that the customs of establishments differ; that large dealers sell on a small margin, and that small dealers, who supply the poorest classes in the community, sell on a large margin; that qualities of goods enter into the whole question, and that differences in make produce incongruities and uncertainties

in all directions. All these matters are fully understood and have been fully considered, and every effort has been made to overcome the resulting obstacles.

Much misapprehension has existed in the public mind relative to this great statistical investigation by the Senate Finance Committee ; but the public can rest assured that the chief aim of the committee is to secure absolutely impartial results and let the consequences take care of themselves. On this basis its members are, as already remarked, working with entire unanimity, and with every prospect of being able to make a unanimous report so far as the facts are concerned. They have had the benefit of the suggestions of all classes of people, of experts on both sides of the great tariff question, of men interested in the financial legislation of the country, and of those who are studying most philosophically, and with the highest patriotism, measures for the improvement of the condition of the people, and who are making efforts to secure the people's highest prosperity.

CARROLL D. WRIGHT.

IS CORPORAL PUNISHMENT DEGRADING?

BY THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S, LONDON.

Is THERE anything degrading in corporal punishment? There is said to be a feeling that such is the case in America, and there are painful signs of the growth of such an opinion in England. On what does it rest?—on a principle for which authority can be claimed? or upon the results of experience? If it rests upon a principle, that principle must have found expression in some book whose claim to attention and obedience is generally admitted, or else must rest upon that universal sense of the fitting and the right, which is thus eloquently described by Hooker:* "The general and perpetual voice of man is as the sentence of God himself. For what all men have at all times learned, Nature herself must needs have taught, and, God being the author of Nature, her voice is but his instrument. By her from him we receive whatsoever in such wise we learn." Before appealing to our own experience, or the well-authenticated experience of others, it will be well to examine what these two great authorities have to say on the subject.

There is no book which is so universally accepted as an authority on all moral questions as the Bible; and the question of punishment, and the best kind of punishment, is essentially a moral question. I take for granted that all sensible persons, Christian or otherwise, will admit that there are in every child born into the world tendencies to evil that need rooting out, and inclinations towards good that need planting or nurturing. I will therefore first examine what this authority, which Christian people will recognize to be such, has to say on the subject, and then I will turn to that general voice of mankind to which those

*"Ecclesiastical Polity," I., VIII., 3.

who are not Christian may be more disposed to attach importance. What, then, has the Bible to say?

It is thus that Solomon, in the Book of Proverbs, lays down a general principle on the subject:* "He that spareth his rod hateth his son: but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes." And then in another portion of the same book he gives the reason for this advice:† "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him." And then, extending his view to the effect of such punishment on a child's future, he says:‡ "Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell." And:§ "The rod and reproof give wisdom: but a child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame." But whilst Solomon gives such unmeasured praise to the use of the rod in the case of children, we have a caution against its excessive use in the punishment of adults, in an earlier book of Holy Scripture.

There is this instruction given by the judges of Israel in the book of Deuteronomy,‖ that, in the event of a controversy arising between men, "if the wicked man be worthy to be beaten, the judge shall cause him to lie down, and be beaten before his face, according to his fault, by a certain number. Forty stripes he may give him, and not exceed: lest, if he should exceed, and beat him above these with many stripes, then thy brother should seem vile unto thee." It is possible that the idea of corporal punishment being degrading may have been drawn from this warning against its abuse. But it is well to note that such punishment is ordered, and therefore must have been approved by the writer; it is only its excessive application that is forbidden. If we turn to the New Testament, we find St. Paul speaking of his own endurance of corporal punishment along with other forms of suffering and trial, without suggesting the idea of an essential difference between them: ¶"In labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned," and so on. And then he seems to regard all such sufferings with a sense of satisfaction, as having endured them all for his Master's sake:** "If I must

*XIII., 24. †XXII., 15. ‡XXIII., 13, 14. §XXIX., 15. ‖XXV., 2, 3.
¶II. Cor., XI., 23-25. **Ibid, v. 30.

needs glory, I will glory of the things which concern mine infirmities." And of one greater than St. Paul we are told that he was scourged, and that * "with his stripes we are healed." Whilst I cannot neglect to remind those who are inclined to forget it that in the epistle to the Hebrews † we read: "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth"; and: "What son is he whom the father chasteneth not?"

I turn from the book of authority to that general voice of mankind which speaks with authority. Greece and Rome are the two nations of antiquity to which appeal is ever made for guidance, as from them we learn what the more cultured nations then thought and did. Corporal punishment certainly existed in the schools of Greece, and we do not find any objections raised to it by Greek writers on the score of its being degrading, though Plutarch thinks it might well be dispensed with. In Rome the family bond was stronger than in Greece, and the power of inflicting corporal punishment that was left in the hands of *paterfamilias* was absolute in earlier times, but it was subsequently limited by law. Quintilian finds grievous fault with teachers who are unsparing in the using of the rod to cover their own negligence, and severely censures the abuse of corporal punishment. But he wrote in days when the glories of Rome were departing; and it is worthy of remark that no children treated their parents with greater tenderness and reverence than did those of Rome in the days when the father possessed an unlimited power of punishment. It would be profitless to trace out the use of corporal punishment in the less civilized nations; but the challenge may be boldly given to those who object to such punishment to point out the nation where it was not to be found and where a higher state of morals or more affectionate family relations could be found than in the two great nations just named. The words of Hooker which I quoted at starting were not intended to apply to a universal consensus concerning corporal punishment, but it seems to me that they are as applicable to that as to other matters, and that when we find civilized and uncivilized nations equally adopting the same method for eradicating vices and curing faults in children, we may conclude that it is what Nature suggests as the most effective instrument for the purpose.

* Isaiah, LIII., 5. † XII., 6, 7.

But we must take care not to assume that such consensus carries us further than it really does. All that I claim for it is that corporal punishment properly administered is not degrading. When applied in excess, I thoroughly accept what is said in Deuteronomy; it may then make our "brother seem vile unto us." Moreover, there can be no doubt that what Quintilian censured in his day is a fault that has existed in most periods of the world's history. The thoughtless, the hasty, the ill-tempered parent or teacher is tempted to make corporal punishment his sole instrument for correcting small faults and grievous moral offences, without taking into account differences of temper or disposition, or taking the trouble to estimate the effect which such chastisement will have upon those subjected to it. In defending corporal punishment I must be understood as defending its use, not its abuse; as approving it when employed after reflection by a judicious parent or instructor, not as practised under the influence of passion or excitement by an angry guardian or teacher.

In examining what light experience can throw on the subject, it may be well to see what influence the two extremes in the method of bringing up children have on their after life and upon their feelings towards the guardians or teachers by whom they have been educated. The two extremes to which I refer are kindness and severity; of course the wisest educator is he who adopts the golden mean, and is so kind as not to destroy a wholesome fear in the child, and so severe as never to diminish its affection. But few people have sufficient wisdom to walk consistently in the golden mean, and consequently in various degrees we find parents and teachers tending systematically towards one or the other extreme. The question is, Which extreme does experience show to be the less dangerous? I fear that I must unhesitatingly give the palm to severity. I wish it were not so. I wish I could believe that the contrary was the case; but I must speak as I have found it.

I remember a dear good friend, one of the most distinguished and excellent men of his day, who could never bring himself to punish his sons, but thought he had sufficiently done his duty when he had remonstrated with them after the commission of any grave fault, whilst lighter offences were passed over without rebuke. Like Eli of old, he would say, "Nay, my sons, for it is no good report that I hear," and there the matter ended. When those sons grew up, nothing was more painful than to witness the indif-

ference, not to say neglect, with which they treated their illustrious father. It seemed as though they were conscious that faults had been nurtured in them by his excessive tenderness that ought to have been uprooted by severer measures, and that they laid all the blame for this at their father's door, and withheld from him that reverence which they ought to have felt, because he had neglected to uphold his own authority over them and had failed to demand that respect and obedience which it was their duty to render. I do not say that they did feel this, but it seemed to an outsider as though such must be the case. On the other hand, I knew a woman whose widowed mother had brought her up in a manner that seemed to me most harsh and unjust. They were in very poor circumstances, and at times the girl was sent out to gather sticks to light the fire: if the child brought too large a stick, the mother would beat her for having stolen it out of a hedge, without examining into the truth of what she asserted. I give this as a sample of the home discipline. Of all the affectionate children I ever knew that daughter was one of the most remarkable. Her wages were freely given to her mother; there was nothing that she would not do to help her: I believe she would willingly have laid down her life for her. It is only right to say that both mother and daughter were excellent Christian women.

I mention these two cases as extremes, as having excited my wonder and surprise at the time; not as recommending either for imitation. But I must also add that in families where the tendency has been in a less degree to one or the other of these extremes, I have found there have been more reverence and affection, more willingness to make sacrifices for parents, more pleasure in contributing to their pleasure and happiness in after life, where the tendency has been to a severe method of treatment than in cases where the tendency has been towards excessive tenderness and kindness. The ancient Romans to whom I have already referred were examples of the effect of the former method of treatment. I fear it would not be difficult to discover examples of the influence of the latter mode almost anywhere in England or America at the present day.

To turn from the effect of severity in the home to its influence at school, where its abuse has been most marked. The old bad system is thus graphically described by an eminent Scotch judge, who was one of the founders of *The Edinburgh Review*. In an

unpublished letter written nearly half a century since, he says: "I am not squeamish about corporal punishment for schoolboys. It is unquestionably necessary. But the misfortune is that the master, like a colonel, who resorts to it habitually, naturally neglects and despises all other and better arts of controlling. And it produces a far deeper feeling of mortification and disgust in boys than the habitual user of the leather* is apt to imagine. Sixty years have not even abated my hateful recollections of the high school on this sole account; and I have known many of our good pupils who, after becoming successful men, have implored me to save our academy boys from what they uselessly suffered." With the opinions here expressed I cordially agree, but I cannot refrain from mentioning what fell under my own experience. In a national school over which I had control there was a clever lad who rendered himself peculiarly obnoxious to the master by being (what is called in school slang) "cheeky." He was consequently flogged frequently and severely. I did more than remonstrate. I forbade such treatment. Years afterwards, when this lad had risen to a position of considerable dignity in the church, I spoke to him sympathetically of his schooldays and the floggings he had received. "Oh," he said at once, "I was not flogged once too often; it did me good." It was evident, therefore, that he did not feel degraded by what he had suffered.

The great Duke of Wellington is reported to have said that he was indebted to the play-fields at Eton for the material which enabled him to conquer Napoleon—in other words, that the physical energy and the moral force of the officers to whom he was largely indebted for his victories were gained in that excellent school. Now, it is certain that corporal punishment was freely employed at Eton. Many, probably most, if not all, of the Duke's officers must have been educated under Dr. Keate, who was notorious for the free use he made of the birch; and it is notorious that these high-spirited, noble men, whose souls would abhor the contact of anything they felt to be degrading, so far from being ashamed of having suffered corporal punishment, made a joke of it and freely talked of it in after life. In reminiscences of Eton by the Rev C. Allix Wilkinson (an old Eton boy who had seen much of the use of the birch), there are these state-

* In Scotland a leather strap called "the taws" is used for corporal punishment, not a cane or birch rod.

ments, which confirm what has been just said: "Keate was a great scholar, an elegant poet, a capital teacher, and we must not hold lightly the man who has flogged half the ministers, secretaries, bishops, generals, and dukes of the present century." And then he thus sums up what he has to say on the subject: "Flogging then, on the whole, as we had it at Eton, by the head master alone, in whose mind there could be no element of spite and consequent severity, and with a few twigs of birch applied, as it still is, where it is not pleasant but can do no real harm to any one, I do not hesitate to say I stand up for, let tender mammas and squeamish parents say what they will; and I am quite sure, from intercourse with my grandchildren and other boys, that they had rather the system should be continued, not, as in our time, flogging for everything, but still flogging with certain restrictions; they like short, sharp, and all over, better than extra absences, long lessons to learn by heart, or one thousand seven hundred lines to write out." (P. 46.)

I had an amusing proof of this punishment not being thought degrading some years since. I was visiting a late head master of Eton, when he said: "Last week I had a party of my old pupils, officers in the army; after dinner one of them playfully lifted his hand as though using a birch rod. I said, 'Oh no; surely, I never switched you'; to which an immediate response was given, 'Oh yes, you did'; and then all the others joined in chorus, 'And me, too'; upon which they all laughed, and seemed heartily amused," clearly showing that they felt no indignity had been put upon them by what had been done, and that they were all the better friends with the master who had inflicted the punishment. It may also be worth mentioning that it was and probably is still considered at Eton a great mark of moral courage for the boy to cut a chip off the block over which he is hoisted to be switched, whilst he is under punishment, and when he succeeds in doing it he wears the chip attached to his watch chain for the rest of his life as an honorable distinction. Archdeacon Denison, an old Eton boy, is a strong advocate of corporal punishment, and thinks that it does much towards forming a manly and disciplined character. It is thus he speaks of it in his "Notes of My Life" (p. 10): "I suffered at Keate's hands three times: twice for playing tricks in my dame's house, once for bathing at a forbidden hour, or rather, I ought to say and with shame to say it,

for fibbing to Keate when he caught us just as we returned. We ran and hid, but were ferreted out. Approaching Keate, with my hat off, and my wet towel hanging out of it, I stated to him that it was a mistake to suppose I had been bathing. He looked at me and said nothing, but next morning, as I richly deserved, I suffered heavily."

So far I have been dealing with one side of the question. I have been endeavoring to show that the opinion that corporal punishment is degrading has no solid foundation on which to rest, but that it is merely a piece of nineteenth-century sentimentalism, born of the notion that the greatest evil in the world is bodily pain. There is another side from which to view it, and to that I turn.

I suppose there are few, if any, rational people who will not admit that, human nature being what it is, we must have some kind of punishment both for youths and adults, and that, for punishment to be of any value, it must be something that the person on whom it is to be inflicted will dislike and seek to avoid. In England we have abolished flogging in the army, and experienced military men say that the effect of this will be that in time of war certain offences, which have hitherto been punished by flogging, will be punished by death, as it is impossible to preserve discipline and protect the army from serious peril without severely visiting breaches of discipline and duty, and no other punishment is possible in the field. So with respect to children : if we are to train them up to habits of reverence and respect for guardians and instructors ; if we are to instil into them habits of industry and application to studies to which they are disinclined, there must be in reserve some power of compulsion which they will be afraid to invoke, and that power must be punishment. The boy who will say to his father, when threatening to box his ears for being disobedient or impertinent, "If you do, I will summon you before a magistrate," will soon set all parental authority at defiance, if his threat is allowed to prevail, and the natural consequence will be an undisciplined life, estrangement between father and son, probably a vicious youth and a miserable old age. For the sake of the child, of the family, of society, of the country, there must be some deterrent punishment, both at home and at school. The question is, What shall it be ? Whatever it is, to make it effective it must be well and wisely administered, with a

single desire to amend the child, and not under the excitement of anger or irritated feeling. Moreover, it must be proportioned to the offence, and not an indiscriminate application of the same treatment, whether the wrongdoing be great or small,—a casual neglect or thoughtless disobedience that has to be amended, or a serious moral delinquency that has to be cured.

For purposes of discipline there ought, therefore, to be drawn a sharp line between grave offences which denote serious moral obliquity, such as dishonesty, drunkenness, treachery, and such like, in an aggravated form, and offences which spring from a less vicious source. For the less serious kind of wrongdoing, what can be better than suitable corporal punishment? It is sharp and short; it is sufficiently unpleasant to make it disliked; whilst it has the advantage of teaching a boy to bear bodily pain without screaming, as every boy with noble instincts would despise himself for yelling over a little pain in the presence of his companions. It is what brave, high-spirited boys greatly prefer to any other kind of punishment, as it does not interfere with their ordinary sports. I well remember a manly, high-toned boy grumbling to me one day because at his school the master had substituted a task for some strokes over the hand for trifling offences; as he well said, "It interferes with our games, spoils our chance of any enjoyment of our leisure time, and makes us do work in which there is no good." On the other hand, a tame-spirited lad who took no part in games, and only loafed about during holiday time, would find little to annoy him in the work he would have to do, as it would be an excuse for not sharing in games in which he ought to take part, and would nurture the idea that bodily pain was the greatest of evils.

With the increasing luxury of the present day there is special need for what will help to strengthen the moral fibre of the boy, and, by encouraging fortitude under the infliction of bodily pain, nurture true manliness and courage, without which no man can play well his part in life. Moreover, it is well to look at the possible alternatives for corporal punishment. The ordinary one is writing out a number of lines from some Greek, Latin, or English author, perhaps writing some lines over twenty or thirty or more times; and then there is a cunning device of tying several pens together, so as to make one action of the hand multiply itself; or if the boy has money he pays some one to

do the task for him; or perhaps, instead of an imposition, the boy has to learn a certain number of lines. All such punishments make manly boys who are apt to be disinclined to learning, hate it still more; and if they impel them to avoid the faults which they are intended to cure, it is at the expense of implanting other faults of a different character.

With respect to other transgressions of a more serious character, or vices, as I should prefer to call them, some more serious punishment is needed. They degrade the boy; they lower his moral status; if not checked and uprooted, they will lower his character for life. They need some sterner and severer punishment; something that is felt to be degrading; something from which whatever of true nobility there is in the boy will revolt. I object to corporal punishment being employed as the remedy for such offences. I think it degrades such punishment, and makes it less applicable for purposes where it would be useful. And if it be said that in such cases it might be much more severe, then I object to it because it savors of cruelty, and so might harden the youth on whom it is inflicted. I should greatly prefer expulsion from the school or college, with every circumstance that could tend to make such a punishment felt to be degrading. It would then be a crisis in the boy's life; the sentence would be dreaded as something injurious to, if not destructive of, his future career, and if there was any good in him it would be aroused to make a serious effort to regain the position he had lost, whilst if there was no good in him a stigma would be fixed on him which would preserve others from being injured by him.

In England there is an excellent regulation for admission into the position of an officer in the army. "A certificate of good moral character must be produced, signed by the tutors or heads of the schools or colleges at which he has received his education for the four years immediately preceding the date of application; or some other satisfactory proof of good moral character." And I believe there is the same requirement for the navy. Expulsion from school or college for a grave moral offence therefore disqualifies a boy from serving the Queen in either of these distinguished professions. Such a punishment is degrading, and is felt to be such. But it is the offence which degrades; not the mere imposition of the punishment which proclaims the fact of the degradation to others. And as our lower nature is apt to

think more of the loss of dignity or position in the eyes of others than it does of the wrongdoing for which the punishment is inflicted, it becomes effective in bringing home to the mind of the transgressor the abhorrence in which society holds the vice or the crime of which he has been guilty.

I have mentioned one way in which in England a punishment that is meant to be degrading is inflicted ; but every nation must have its own method of providing such a protection for the well-being of its people, and it is necessary that such punishments should be adapted to the differing habits and feelings of the various classes and grades of society of whom a nation is made up. For it is obvious that what would be felt as degrading by a highly-educated and cultivated man would have no such effect upon an uncultured, coarse, or rough-natured person.

Looking upon punishment, therefore, as designed to correct faults, to preserve the authority of superiors, to eradicate tendencies to vice, and to assist in implanting habits of industry and virtue in children otherwise inclined, I believe that no form of it is better adapted to its purpose than that which Solomon recommends and all nations have adopted. I only regret that its abuse has given too much ground for protests against its use, and I gladly raise my voice in favor of its wise and judicious application.

ROBERT GREGORY.

ITALY AND THE POPE.

BY EX-PRIME-MINISTER CRISPI.

PART II.

COUNT CAVOUR was convinced that he would succeed in his negotiations with the Vatican. General Lamarmora, as appears from a letter of his of February 17, 1861, said as much to the cabinet of Berlin, which then took a great interest in these grave questions. He said :

"M. de Schleinitz asked me,' How will you get through with Rome?' I answered that Count Cavour had not lost his hope of settling this grave question in time; that, as he had said to the Chamber, he thought it possible that the Pope might remain at Rome together with the King of Italy."*

Pius IX. was easily irritated, but, as he was of a gentle disposition, he wished to free himself from the subjection in which he had been politically kept by Napoleon III. He was weary of the French troops ; he was displeased with their much too libertine customs ; he desired a solution which should get him rid of the foreign powers, and he had several times, in order to show this, written to the Emperor and spoken to the French ambassador. I have under my eyes at this time an autograph letter which the Pope ordered Cardinal Antonelli to send to the Duke Gramont. I give the text of it :

"After the understanding had with the predecessor of the present ambassador of France, in regard to the evacuation of Rome by the foreign troops ; after the conference at Paris in 1856, in which consideration was had of the pretended abnormal condition of the pontifical states on account of the presence in those states of those troops, which ought to have been recalled, and, in fact, were not, and this not through any request made in our behalf, but solely by the will of one who chose to leave them here against the opinion of

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. VI., p. 187.

the conference; after my letter written to His Majesty the Emperor of the French in August, 1857, which has remained entirely without reply in regard to that part which referred to the troops; after the understanding which at this very time has been had by the Cardinal Secretary of State with the ambassador as to the considerations submitted by me touching the total evacuation by the aforesaid troops of both parts of the Apennines,—it could never have been imagined that a treaty would have been submitted to me of a sort which no honest man can properly describe about sending reënforcements, as I this moment learn. This fact must be made known by me to the whole world, and with it should be communicated to the ambassador my most lively displeasure, and he must undertake to see that these reënforcements, which are on their way, are stopped at Civita Vecchia, whence they can with less trouble return as soon as possible to France. The ambassador should be told that I speak, and will speak publicly, as a duty of my conscience."

The negotiations of February, 1861, went on slowly and with difficulty. In order to smooth away the obstacles which arose, Padre Passaglia went to Turin, and left it again after he came to an agreement with the ministers about the articles which were to serve as a basis for the settlement. On his return to Rome he found things in a good condition, and if the propositions and the credentials promised by Count Cavour had come quickly, perhaps something would have been obtained; but these were received after twenty days' delay, and when it was too late.

One day—it was in the month of March—the prelates who were accustomed to confer with Pius IX. in regard to Italian questions, found him very much irritated. Bertelli was terrified by this, but Cardinal Santucci was not; he, on the contrary, wished to hurry things on, and to reach a conclusion. All was useless. On the 31st of March Pantaleoni was expelled, and Passaglia, after trying to renew the negotiation, lost all hope of bringing it to a successful end.

What were the reasons of this change of front at the Vatican? There were several. In the three months during which proposals of harmony were discussed, the secret had not been kept. Antonelli imputed this to the Italian negotiators; Cavour imputed it to some prelate who, for official reasons, might have had knowledge of them.* What is certain is that the Jesuit party, learning of these negotiations, worked hard and with great skill to frighten Pius IX. They told him that the Piedmontese minister was not

* Antonino Isaia's "Negotiations between Count Cavour and Cardinal Antonelli for the Surrender of the Temporal Power of the Pope," pp. 29, 30.

sincere, that he would not keep his agreement, and that he, the Pope, would find himself entangled as was Pius VII. with Napoleon I. To strengthen his suspicions they recalled to him the laws published in Umbria and in the Marches for the suppression of the religious corporations, and the decrees, hostile to the church, issued by the lieutenant of the King in the kingdom of Naples. To this was added the insidious and continued action on the Pope of the King and Queen of Naples, whom Count Cavour at Paris had unsuccessfully endeavored to have expelled from Rome. Francis II. was treated as the legitimate King of the Two Sicilies by General Goyon, who even had the French troops reviewed before his Neapolitan Majesty.* Finally, we must remember that the solution of the problem, as proposed by Cavour and listened to by the pontifical curia, was unwelcome at Paris.†

Conciliation between the two powers would have taken away every reason for his interference and influence in Italy from Napoleon III., who would have been obliged, without any compensation, to recall his troops.

"The Emperor," as Prince Napoleon wrote to Cavour, "who has occupied it for twelve years, does not wish that the evacuation of that city shall wear the appearance of a defeat of his policy or of a retreat before the unity of Italy, which has been accomplished contrary to his plans."

Prince Napoleon proposed, in the name of his cousin, articles of a treaty which were afterwards incorporated in the convention of September, and he added :

"The Emperor will remain before public opinion in Europe within the programme which he has drawn up—that is, to maintain the temporal power of the Pope at Rome and in the patrimony of St. Peter."

In simple truth, I do not wish to utter a word of blame against Cavour for the manner in which he bore himself in these negotiations with the Vatican; but it is clear from his letters that he made the mistake in good faith of putting the Emperor entirely out of the question in this delicate argument. It was on the 26th of September, 1860, that he thought it necessary to open his mind to Napoleon III., from whom he expected friendly support.

"The Emperor," he wrote to Dr. Pantaleoni, "earnestly desires an agreement between the King and the Pope,—an agreement which will permit him to withdraw his troops from Rome; but his ideas in regard to the terms of such an agreement are not yet very clearly fixed. The knowledge

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. IV., p. 211. † Ibid, pp. 211, 212.

of our project, I hope, will assist to bring him into our way of thinking; and in that case we may count upon a new element of success." *

Count Cavour, in the same conviction, wrote to Vimercati, his agent at Paris, on the 13th of January, 1861, in these terms:

"Teccio† sends word that when the Pope asked from Cardinal Santucci the project of agreement, notwithstanding the counsel of Pantaleoni, he thought he ought to communicate to him our ideas. His Holiness did not positively reject them. The Pope sent for Cardinal Antonelli, who, after having opposed them, finally agreed to examine the question from the point of view of the complete surrender of the temporal power. They had on Friday a conference with Padre Passaglia.

"Make this all known to the Emperor, and also that we do not wish to involve him in negotiations which may be absolutely contrary to his calculations."‡

The man of the 2d of December, always a man of dissimulation and faithlessness, could not change his nature. What he wanted was obvious, and I have mentioned it above in referring to the language of Prince Napoleon. From the Tuileries, on the 15th of January, 1861, a reply came to the despatch of Cavour, in which the Emperor wished good success to his treaty, but had very little hope of seeing it come to a successful end. Meantime he was really intriguing, and the real cause of his doubtful predictions appears from the story told by Abbé Isaia in his little work. Cardinal Antonelli kept the secret during the negotiations, and to every inquiry which was made by others he replied by absolutely denying that there were any negotiations at all between Italy and the Vatican. He wanted to protect himself by diplomacy until the convention should be absolutely signed. His design failed, and it is clear that the mischief was done by the imprudence of the cabinet at Turin and by the deliberate hostility of Paris. It is well to observe that the Triple Alliance did not exist, and that France, politically and militarily, had no reason to suspect Italy. Here is the story of Abbé Isaia:

"How this happened we were utterly ignorant, but the fact is that the Duke Gramont, the ambassador of France, being interrogated by his government as to whether any kind of agreement was going on at Rome between the Holy See and the Italian Government, for his part answered with an absolute negative. One fine day, being informed by his own government of the negotiations, and the point which they had reached, he ap-

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. IV., p. 137.

† Teccio was a diplomatic agent who had remained in Rome after the rupture of the relations of the King with Santucci.

‡ "Letters of Cavour," Vol. IV., p. 150.

peared both indignant and confused in the presence of the cardinal secretary, almost in a tone of reprobation accusing him of something like an intention of entering into formal treaties with the Italian Government without having informed the representatives of the French government, which, nevertheless, had shown itself so interested to protect the interests of the Holy See. Not knowing exactly what to say, the cardinal secretary positively denied everything, protesting at the same time that he had never even touched any such matter.

"The French ambassador appeared to be satisfied with the reply, and the thing then had no further consequences between the cardinal and the Duke Gramont; but very different was it as far as concerned Cardinal Santucci and the Cardinal Secretary of State. He showed great dissatisfaction at finding that the thing had been spoiled in its very inception. It is sad to see how the great minister had deceived himself and how he expected the completion of his designs from the help of the person who was the most formidable obstacle to them."

On the 22d of February, 1861, after he had sent the papers to Passaglia, he wrote to one of his friends:

"The Emperor has been informed of all. He takes the most lively interest in this negotiation, and makes Connau explicitly declare that he will be most delighted with this agreement, which will put him at liberty to withdraw the French troops from Rome. He offers to put his own private machinery of influence at work upon Antonelli to assist us in our labors."

And some days later, on the 3d of March, 1861,—that is, when the opposition at Rome was most active,—Cavour, full of confidence, wrote to Senator Pietri:

"By giving the Roman question the legitimate solution Rome and Italy expect, the Emperor does more for us than if he delivered us entirely from the Germans." *

The negotiations between Italy and the Holy See were peremptorily broken off; and no wonder that they were; nor is it necessary to look for the author of this rupture elsewhere than at Paris. The reaction came out of the matter victorious, and began its persecution at once of those who had undertaken to further the settlement. Passaglia and Isaia were obliged to leave Rome, and later on Cardinal d'Andrea was compelled to retire to Naples.

I have said already, in referring to a letter of Prince Napoleon, what the propositions of the Emperor were for the solution of the disagreement with the Pope. Cavour was not satisfied with them, but he was obliged to give a reply because the agreement between the Holy See and Paris was made a condition of the recognition of the new kingdom. Whilst the recognition was made by

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. IV., p. 185.

London unconditionally and with true disinterestedness five days after the Parliament had proclaimed Victor Emmanuel King of Italy, the cabinet of the Tuileries, cavilling, sought for means of opposition.

Count Cavour replied on the 17th to the letter of the 14th of April, accepting the conditions which were imposed upon him. He made only two additions, with which he hoped that he might save the dignity of his government.

"At the same time," he writes, "I will allow myself to indicate two points which appear to me of the highest importance. In the first place, the recognition of the kingdom of Italy ought to take place on the very day of the signature of the treaty. For this purpose we will arm the personage who is to sign the treaty with credentials which he can immediately lay before the Emperor. This mission will be so much more solemn in character that its object will be special and not temporary. In the second place, without engaging itself to give us direct assistance, France may promise us its good offices to bring the Pope to consent to a final agreement with Italy in harmony with the principles which Cardinal Santucci and Father Passaglia have submitted to Cardinal Antonelli. This clause would have the immense advantage of making the court of Rome more prudent and the Roman people more patient. I do not doubt that secrecy will be kept as well at Paris as at Turin; but it appears to me essential not to take Gramont into our confidence. He is not always sufficiently on his guard towards Cardinal Antonelli, who excels in the art of penetrating the real intentions of diplomats with whom he has to deal." *

Count Cavour did not disguise from himself the importance of the act he was about to perform, and the deplorable impression it would make on the Italian people. He wrote to Passaglia on the 27th of May, six days before his death, that the treaty he was agreeing upon with France would be essentially transitory, that it would not pledge the future; but, fearing the indignation of Garibaldi, he asked the help of the Garibaldian agent, who was to be told.

"I am about accomplishing an act which will make me the most unpopular man in Italy for a certain time. This act I shall accomplish, for it is the only way to settle a very great difficulty. I shall conclude with France a convention under which France will withdraw her troops from Rome. On my part I shall engage to protect the papal frontier, and not to permit the revolution to enter those states. Be ready, I beg you, for in a few days, when the treaty is concluded, I shall ask you to go and see General Garibaldi. You will have to make him understand the imperious necessity which obliges me to undergo this convention." †

Death on the 2d of June, 1861, removed Count Cavour, and prevented him from concluding the convention which he would

* "Letters of Cavour," Vol. VI., p. 703. † Ibid.

have "undergone" in the hope of soon freeing himself from it, and not as a definitive act.

The negotiations with the Emperor were undertaken again by Baron Ricasoli, but with no result. Interrupted by various motives during the ministry of Rattazzi, who certainly desired to get rid of the Roman question which brought him to the catastrophe of Aspromonte, the dolorous heritage fell to the ministry of Minghetti, and everybody knows how the convention of September, 1864, which guaranteed Rome to the Pope, caused Minghetti the utmost pain and disgust, because he had to undergo not only the bitter censure of his adversaries, but also the desertion of his political friends.

The Emperor meanwhile could not maintain his ill humor against the cabinet of Turin, and, as Cavour himself has written to Prince Napoleon, in a letter already referred to, a perfect reconciliation between Italy and France was necessary in order that the enemies of the two governments might not take advantage of the uncertain condition in which their official relations were. Therefore, on the 15th of June, 1861, the minister, Thouvenel, by order of his chief, wrote that he recognized the new kingdom, but with such and so many protests as to things which had happened the year before, and with so many reservations for the future, that his letter appeared to be rather an act of politeness than an adhesion to the new monarchy. As to the Roman question, its declarations were more explicit. Thouvenel wrote :

"The cabinet of Turin will take account of the duties which our position towards the Holy See imposes upon us, and I should think it superfluous to add that in establishing our official relations with the Italian Government we shall in no wise weaken or diminish the value of the protests which have been issued by the court of Rome against the invasion of several provinces of the pontifical states. The government of King Victor Emmanuel cannot wish any more than we do to contest or lose sight of all the considerations of many kinds which affect the Roman question and necessarily dominate our resolution, and the Italian Government will understand that, in recognizing the King of Italy, we must continue to occupy Rome so long as sufficient guarantees do not cover the interests which took us to Rome."

Baron Ricasoli replied, not perhaps with the high spirit which belonged to his own character, in a manner to protect the national rights over Rome :

"Our wish is to restore to Italy her glorious capital, but our intention is to take nothing away from the grandeur of the church or the independence

of the august head of the Catholic religion. Consequently it gives us pleasure to hope that the Emperor, within some little time, will be able to recall his troops from Rome without thereby causing in the minds of sincere Catholics any apprehensions which we should be the first to regret. The interests of France herself, we are convinced, will determine the French Government to take this step, leaving it to the high wisdom of the Emperor to appreciate the proper moment at which Rome may be left without danger to herself. We shall always make it our duty to facilitate this solution, and we hope that the French Government will not refuse us its good offices to bring the court of Rome to accept an agreement which will be fertile in fortunate consequences for the future of religion as well as for the fate of Italy."

The Roman question, since 1861, has been the incubus of all Italian governments, and, thanks to the opposition kept up from Paris, it was one cause of the odium against Napoleon III. The convention of September, 1864, embittered the popular mind by the unjust clauses it contained and by the violent way in which it was executed in the removal of the capital from Turin to Florence. The French troops went out of the eternal city, but they went back again after Mentana. The conflict between the Garibaldians and the imperial troops in November, 1867, the executions which took place at Rome, and the arrest of Garibaldi increased the aversion of our people to France and their contempt for the Pope. Remembering Italian enthusiasm for the victor of Magenta and Solferino, and the brilliant hopes of 1859, we may see what and how great must have been the concert of curses against the Emperor, who, protecting with the bayonet the sacerdotal power which had reërected the guillotine, prevented the settlement of our national union.

Unity for Italy is a guarantee of her life, and unity without Rome cannot be secured. The pope-king in the centre of the peninsula was a permanent danger to the public peace. He was always an element of discord, because in all times, through his temporal interests, he brought foreign arms into the country to the injury of the nation. The English envoy, Paget, writing to Lord Granville, declared that the pontifical court was the centre of the conspiracies of the revolutionary party, which at the first occasion would have taken up arms against the Italian monarchy.* Now, this state of things could not be tolerated. In 1869 the cabinet of Vienna, having made the withdrawal of the French garrisons from the cities of the holy church the basis of an

* "Archives Diplomatiques," 1874.

agreement, the cabinet of Paris refused this, and thereupon the alliance between Austria, France, and Italy, which had been proposed by Count Beust, became impossible.

The senseless war which Napoleon provoked in 1870, and which was a disaster for him and for his country, opened the way to Rome and compelled the cabinet of Lanza to attempt the solution of the difficulty between the King of Italy and the Pope. Count Ponza di San Martino was sent to Pius IX. to invite him to an agreement, but the envoy of Victor Emmanuel was not listened to. In 1861 Count Cavour had contented himself with a royal vicariate in perpetuity over the states of the Holy See. In 1870 Visconti Venosta did not completely settle the problem of the temporal power, but proposed that it should be limited to the Leonine City. Neither vicariate nor Leonine City would be accepted. Pius IX. was inflexible in his *non possumus*. General Cadorna, at the head of his troops, settled the question with the cannon. The note of Visconti Venosta, addressed to all the powers, on the 29th of August, 1870, remains as a political monument in the annals of Italian national life. After explaining the efforts made for an agreement with the Vatican from 1860 onward, this letter ends by pointing out the following articles:

CONDITIONS WHICH ITALY HAD MADE FOR THE HOLY SEE.

To the Pope, his dignity inviolable and all the other prerogatives of sovereigns, and, furthermore, precedence of the King and of all other sovereigns according to custom.

To the cardinals of the Roman Church, the title of princes, with all that the title implies. The Leonine City will be under the full jurisdiction and sovereignty of the Pope.

The Italian Government guarantees within its territory, first, full liberty of communication between the pontiff and other states, clergy, and foreign peoples; second, the diplomatic immunity of the pontifical legates and nuncios with foreign powers and of foreign nuncios with the Holy See.

All the institutions, offices, and ecclesiastical bodies to be preserved and with their administration in Rome.

All the ecclesiastical properties, the rents of which are appropriated to the churches, offices, corporations, institutions, and ecclesiastical bodies established at Rome and in the Leonine City, to be preserved without being subjected to any special taxes.

The government shall not concern itself with the internal discipline of the ecclesiastical bodies in Rome.

The bishops and the curates of the kingdom, in their dioceses and in their parishes, to be free from any action of the government in the exercise of their spiritual ministry.

The King to renounce in favor of the church every right of royal patronage, every ecclesiastical benefice, lesser or greater, in the city of Rome.

The constitution for the Holy See and for the Holy College of a fixed donation, not to be diminished, of a value not inferior to that which was appropriated in the budget of the pontifical states.

All the employees, civil and military, of the pontifical states, if Italian subjects, to be protected in their grade, their stipends, and their relative rank.

The aforesaid articles shall be deemed as a bilateral public contract, and shall be the subject of international agreement with all the powers which have Catholic subjects."*

These conditions were more than absurd, and their author can only be excused because he hoped that they would be accepted by the Vatican, and that the use of force would thereby be avoided to secure the occupation of the pontifical territory. The reader will observe, above all, that the civil power of the Pope was admitted, only the exercise of it being restricted. Now, if the principle is admitted, the application was certain, because it gave the Holy See the right to reclaim in the future the restitution of the provinces which had been taken from it. The vice of the institution we have destroyed consisted in this—in the confusion of the two dominions, temporal and spiritual. The prince who claims to represent God upon the earth, who is infallible in his acts, beyond control, can only be an absolute sovereign. Now, no one has a right to condemn a people to slavery; and to take the Leonine City out of the sovereignty of Italy was an offence against the national sovereignty. The population of the Leonine City protested against this injustice, and on the 2d of October, 1870, contrary to the wishes of the government, they also desired a plebiscitum of union with the Italian monarchy. More grave and full of danger was the proposition that the pontifical guarantees might be made the subject of an international treaty. Such a condition Cavour himself refused in 1861, because it would give rise to pretexts for interventions. The question of the powers of the Pope, the existence even of the papacy, would then not be questions of Italian interest nor subjects of Italian public law, but matters for examination and judgment by foreign powers. The independence of Italy would have been compromised by this. There were those who regarded the expedition of General Cadorna as a violation of the convention of September 16, 1864. There was no such violation, because that convention was not executed by France; and if it had been faithfully

* "Archives Diplomatiques," 1874, pp. 2, 37, 38.

executed by France, no international agreement is valid when it offends the imprescriptible, eternal right of a people to its liberty.

The convention of September permitted the Pope to have an army, but it did not give the right to France to keep her soldiers at Rome, because, in that case, the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome would have been a delusion and a deceit. At Mentana we discovered that the legion of Antibes was composed of imperial recruits, whose services to the Pope were paid as services rendered to the French Empire. It is singular that on the dead bodies were found livrets of French regiments, to which every one of these men belonged, with the number of his matriculation, and with the formula of the oath of fidelity to the Emperor. Visconti Venosta, in his note before cited, explained that the pontifical army, in the way in which it had been constituted, represented a real foreign intervention, and that this was contrary to the spirit of the agreement with France. It was not a question of troops who were to receive their mission to preserve public order, nor limited by that object, but of an organized force which had assumed the character of an army of the reaction, of a military body destined to a new crusade in the interests of the Pope.*

On the 6th of September, 1874, in a conversation of Jules Favre with Count Nigra, the French minister frankly replied in this fashion to the Italian ambassador, "The convention of September 15th is very dead,"† and M. Senard, *chargé d'affaires* of the French Republic at Florence, wrote on the 22d of the same month of that same year to King Victor Emmanuel, expressing the same sentiments. He said:

"The convention of September 15 has virtually ceased to exist, and we have to thank your Majesty for having chosen to understand this and to appreciate the thought which alone has prevented official denunciation of a treaty which, on both sides, had come to nothing."‡

Cardinal Antonelli asked for the help of the Catholic powers, but no one replied conformably to his wishes. The idea of an international conference for the regulation of the position of the Pope towards the King of Italy was expressed by Gladstone on January 31, 1871. It was taken up by Count Beust, and it was not refused by Visconti Venosta. Jules Favre, in an open manifesto against the temporal power, thought such a conference

* "Archives Diplomatiques," 1874, pp. 2, 24. † Ibid, p. 39. ‡ Ibid, p. 95.

full of danger. Antonelli said in a note of his that the Holy See would never have consented to it.

The Pope, in the midst of all these troubles, comforted himself by directing a brief to the company of Jesuits, in which he bitterly censured the acts of the sub-alpine government.* Before the Italian ministry had transported itself to Rome, it appealed to the Parliament to abrogate the law intended to establish the prerogative of the sovereign pontiff and to establish and regulate the relations of the state with the church. The temporal power was completely abolished, and, in consequence, the Leonine City was not excluded from the benefits of this law, nor did any one have the idea of making the concessions made to the chief of the Catholic Church the subject of an international agreement. For the other clauses of the law the lines were followed of the note addressed to foreign powers on August 29, 1870. The proposed law, long debated in the two Chambers, became a statute on May 13, 1871. The governments which for twenty years have succeeded each other in Italy considered it a debt of honor to execute this law religiously. The Pope has never recognized it. In an encyclical of May 15, 1891, Pius IX. protested, declaring that, for the exercise of his spiritual functions, he had need of his temporal power.

The law of the 13th of May, 1871, gave the Roman Church more prerogatives and more liberty than exist for any other form of worship in any civilized state in the world. The Pope was fortified in his spiritual citadel, and no one can materially assail him. He can strike at the mighty, but no one has the means or the force to strike at him. When the Pope was a temporal prince, an ironclad at Civita Vecchia or an army of invasion on the frontiers of his territory might have compelled him to surrender to the exigencies of a foreign state. To-day this is no longer possible, and Pius IX., by the conditions of invulnerability which were established for him by the Italian Parliament, proved his omnipotence in the strife which he sustained against the Emperor of Germany during the course of nine years. The Emperor William had shown himself openly, from the beginning, an enemy of the temporal power of the Pope, and he was not turned from his position by the clergy of Posen, who, with the archbishop at their head, went to beg the old monarch to intercede for Pius IX.

* "Archives Diplomatiques," 1874, p. 217.

The difficulties between the imperial government and the episcopacy increased with the new secularization laws, and Bismarck had to expel the Jesuits, who, he was satisfied, were fomenting revolution. In Saxony, in Hesse, the bishops pronounced for the Pope and against the Emperor. Several of them were arrested and the income of the parishes taken away. The clergy in 1874 refused to celebrate the anniversary of Sedan, declaring that this brought to mind a victory against the Holy See. Pius IX., who, having written to the Emperor, had not been able to get any modification in the ecclesiastical legislation of Germany, on the 3d of February, 1875, promulgated an encyclical by which he obliged the bishops and the archbishop to protest in their strife against the civil power.

Peace between the church and the empire was finally made in 1878, with some concessions favorable to the clergy and with the reëstablishment of the present legation near the Vatican.

The law of the 3d of May, 1871, provides that the Pope shall confine himself to his spiritual mission and that he shall abandon temporal interests, and assures to him inviolability of his person, territorial immunity, liberty of speech and of the pen, absolute right of communication with the Catholic world, the power to summon councils, if the conditions were conscientiously observed. But time has proved the contrary. The Pope conspires for the restoration of the temporal power. His restoration becomes a danger for the government where he resides. To-day this danger has become greater since the evolution of Leo XIII. towards the republic. This change of policy cannot pass unobserved, and the dynasties of the old continent would do well to take notice of it. In France, among the priests, many have become adherents of the republic, and the evolution will be efficacious and go on increasing among their ranks, because we must remember that in that country the clergy are an official body. This is the political apostleship of republicanism which began with Cardinal Lavigerie, who, as its pretentious champion, threatens all the states of Europe. It is an enemy of terrible force, much more formidable because its effects are not immediately perceptible.

The new ecclesiastical public law does not satisfy the Pope; but in time it may develop most serious consequences for the King of Italy. It does not satisfy the Pope, because he does not

consider himself free when he is not master, and he gives it to be believed that the state is oppressing him when it does not obey him. The Catholic priest is never satisfied with what is given to him; every concession is always beneath what he desires, and his exactions grow in exact proportion to the benefits he obtains. It may be of the most serious consequence to the King of Italy that this public ecclesiastical law exists, because in the territory of the monarchy, in the capital of the kingdom, he is confronted with the pretender. Fortunately for us, Leo XIII. has no followers in our country; the people will never take up arms for him. But he has many lines of action. The confessional and the pulpit disturb the masses, trouble the consciences of the people, and breed disorder in moments of war. This gives me no trouble for the future of our country, which is strong enough to defend herself against all internal enemies; but the work of the Pope may result in crippling our action in the case of a foreign aggression.

In matters of religion I recognize only three logical formulas—the Oriental orthodox, the Roman Catholic, and the American formulas. The Oriental Church is dependent upon the prince, who is at one and the same time head of the church and temporal king. The American Church has for its chief a magistrate, who acts as bishop and as king. In the powerful American nation, the profession and the free exercise of all religious beliefs, and of all forms of worship, with preëminence granted to none, are permitted; liberty of conscience is guaranteed which does not degenerate into license, and the public peace and security are protected. The Oriental religion is Roman Catholicism, with the formulas of despotism and intolerance; the American is the formula of liberty.

Italy in 1871 adopted a system which does not embrace either of these three formulas. It keeps alive a struggle which may lead to a crisis unless we shall see the papacy conferred upon an evangelical man, who, renouncing the civil advantages of this religion, will occupy himself wholly with his spiritual functions. This is what all honest men desire for the good of the state and of the church.

CRISPI.

RAILWAY RATES.

BY GENERAL HORACE PORTER.

As THE physician feels the pulse of the patient to ascertain the state of his health, so the public looks to the rates to judge of the condition of the railways.

The constant reduction in charges which in this country has continued through a long series of years is the most noticeable feature of the railway situation. The average passenger rate per mile has fallen from over 3 cents in 1870 to 2.12 cents in 1890. The average freight rate per ton per mile has fallen in the same period from over 2 cents to .93 of a cent.

We can form a more intelligent idea of the extremely low figures which the rates in America have reached by comparing them with those of other countries. The following table furnishes a comparison as to passenger rates:

	First-class.	Second-class.	Third-class.
	Cts.	Cts.	Cts.
United Kingdom	4.42	3.20	1.94
France	3.86	2.88	2.08
Germany	3.10	2.32	1.54
United States	2.12	....	....

The figures given for the European countries are the regular schedule rates; the average of all the fares received, including reduced fares at excursion rates, would make the figures somewhat less. The rate named as the average first-class fare of railways in the United States is, strictly speaking, the average earnings per passenger per mile, and includes all classes; but as the first-class passengers constitute about 99 per cent. of the travel, the rate given does not differ materially from the actual first-class fare.

When we take into consideration the excursion and the commutation rates, we find first-class passengers carried as low as half a cent a mile.

The freight rates in the United States are, in general terms, only five-eighths of those charged on the continent of Europe and a little less than one-half of those which prevail in Great Britain. But it will be seen that in reality our charges are relatively even lower than stated by the above figures, when we consider that in the passenger service vastly superior accommodations are furnished in the way of heating, lighting, ventilation, ice-water, lavatories, and free carriage of baggage; and that in the transportation of merchandise greater advantages are afforded by running freight trains at higher speed, making longer hauls without breaking bulk, and allowing cars to remain a greater length of time in the hands of shippers for loading and unloading; there being usually employed from the latter cause from 20 to 25 per cent. more cars than would be necessary for the strict hauling of the traffic.

In this connection we must also recollect that the cost of fuel, wages, and all construction material is considerably higher here than in Europe, while the population from which the railways derive their support is much more sparse; the United States having 166,000 miles of railway with a population of 63,000,000, while Europe has only 135,000 miles with a population of 335,000,000.

When we consider the significant fact that for many years the improved equipment and higher speed of trains have entailed a steady increase in expense, the wages of the employees have been advanced, and the land required for additional sidings, terminals, and extensions has risen incalculably in price, while at the same time rates have undergone a continual reduction, the mind is naturally directed to an inquiry as to the cause.

Over-production, the potent factor in the reduction of profits in all business, has made itself felt in the multiplication of competing railways, and the opening-up of water-ways. Besides this, some of the traffic will not bear a remunerative rate, such as low-priced crop products, lean ores, etc., which have to be hauled a long distance to reach a market.

The legislatures of several of the States have enacted laws to effect a reduction of rates, the literal obedience to some of which would amount to the practical confiscation of railway property.

They have not confined themselves to the exercise of direct legislative action, as the immediate representatives of the people, but have resorted to the pernicious practice of delegating the extraordinary power to fix rates to commissions composed of a few individuals. What is known as the "Granger" warfare against railways began in several States as early as 1873. In the year 1887 Congress enacted the Inter-State-Commerce Law. Some of its provisions, such as those requiring the publication of open tariffs, which cannot be changed without due notice, prohibiting the issuing of passes, and prescribing penalties for discriminations to shippers, strike at acknowledged evils in railway management, and commend themselves to all good citizens; but in other respects the law imposes so many unreasonable requirements and restrictions that it virtually deprives the railways of the few means which had been left to them of maintaining remunerative rates. Principal among these are what is known as the "long- and short-haul clause," which prohibits railway companies from receiving any greater compensation in the aggregate for a shorter than for a longer haul over the same line in the same direction, the shorter being included within the longer distance; and the anti-pooling clause, which prevents railway companies from entering into any agreements with each other for an apportionment of joint earnings.

Like the law once passed by Congress to regulate the price of gold in the public market, and like all efforts to substitute legislative enactments for nature's great law of supply and demand, the tendency has been largely in the direction of defeating the very objects for which the Inter-State-Commerce Law was ostensibly enacted. One purpose was to prevent combinations on the part of railways; but the impossibility of reaching any harmony between the companies through coöperative measures, dictated by the natural laws of business, is gradually forcing them into joint ownerships and formidable consolidations. Another alleged object was to unify the methods of doing business among the various roads, to secure open and uniform rates, and to prevent the more powerful lines from becoming monopolies; but the attempt to fit them all to a Procrustean bed—to require them to be operated under the terms of the same law, regardless of their different conditions and circumstances—is having the effect of making the rich roads richer and the poor poorer.

To illustrate this, take the case of two parallel roads between competitive points; one having low grades, light curves, no water competition at local points, an abundance of coal upon its line, well-located terminals, and a large patronage; the other having heavy grades, sharp curves, water competition at local points, no coal along its line, inconvenient terminals, and a small patronage. The same rates and conditions applied to both may enrich the one and bankrupt the other. Before the passage of the congressional law the first line was able to divide a portion of its business or its earnings with the second line and to insure it a living, as a consideration for maintaining remunerative rates. At present the only available means of assisting the poor line is by allowing it a "differential"—that is, agreeing that it may do its business at a rate less than that of its rich rival, for the purpose of securing an increased patronage; and we thus have an instance of the thoroughly illogical practice of a weak company having to carry its freight and passengers at a rate less than that of a more favored competitor, as a consequence of the very fact that it costs the poor company more to do the business. Take also the case of two competitive lines such as the Erie and New York Central between New York and Buffalo. The Inter-State-Commerce Law applies to the former because it happens to run through more than one State, but not to the latter for the reason that it all happens to lie in the same State.

A very grave injustice results to the railways of the United States from the fact that they are hampered by the law, while their active competitors in Canada, some of them heavily subsidized, are not subject to it and are free to obtain remunerative local rates upon business within their own country sufficient in itself to sustain them and earn profits; which enables them to make unprofitable rates upon business competitive with the roads of the United States. If our roads attempt to meet this competition, they have to reduce their local rates and put their entire property in jeopardy.

A similar injustice arises in competition with water-ways. Boat lines, having no capital invested in right of way and being at no expense for its maintenance, are able to make such low rates at competitive points that the railways, restricted as they are, cannot take measures to compete with water transportation. It is true that there is a provision in the act giving the Inter-State-

Commerce Commissioners authority in such cases to suspend the long- and short-haul clause under certain circumstances, but it has not been so generally exercised as to afford the desired relief. The present commissioners have administered the law intelligently and honestly, so that in their hands it has undergone a fair test; but their best efforts have been embarrassed by its inherent defects and by State legislation. The whole subject is in a transition and chaotic state; Federal power and State sovereignty are in frequent conflict; when under the national commission satisfactory inter-State rates are established, State commissions force a different rate through the portion of the territory which is within their jurisdiction; the railway finds itself ground between the upper and nether millstones, and the shipper becomes the victim of constant and unforeseen fluctuations in rates.

A demoralization in rates is frequently attributed to the action of speculative railway managers, who are supposed to break and to restore rates for the purpose of affecting the market price of their speculative holdings of securities; but, while this may be true in some few instances, the public must look for a much more potent cause to explain the evil. It is natural to blame the manager of a railroad, whatever may be his motives, for not maintaining remunerative rates, but it must be recollected that one manager cannot accomplish this result without the coöperation of his competitors. Every one acknowledges the disastrous burdens entailed upon each of the great powers of Europe in maintaining an enormous army, but no one nation can safely disarm unless there is a general disarmament on the part of its rivals. The traffic of a railway is the commodity from the sale of which it must look for its living. If the commodity which a farmer or a merchant sells is not disposed of in one season, he can hold it for the next; but if the commodity of a railroad company is not availed of, it is found that it has been taken possession of by competitors, and that the railway company has suffered a loss which it cannot regain. Hence the railway manager is often inclined to suffer a loss of rates rather than a loss of tonnage.

Heretofore the railway companies of this country have made strenuous, and up to a certain point successful, efforts to meet a reduction of rates by a reduction of expenses. The invention of the cheapened processes for making steel rails created a revolution in the economical working of railways; then

came improved locomotives of increased power and more economical in fuel ; the freight car of ten tons' capacity and ten tons in weight has been superseded by one of thirty tons' capacity and only thirteen tons in weight, thus largely reducing the dead-weight to be hauled. It will thus be seen that many fortunate circumstances have assisted in accomplishing a reduction in expenses which cannot in all likelihood be repeated. A loss in the amount of traffic can be offset in part by a reduction of the working force, but a loss from the decrease of rates does not admit of this remedy.

It is probable that a further reduction in rates would have to be met on some roads by reducing wages and scaling down the interest on securities. We must recollect, in view of such an aspect of the case, that the $10,000,000,000 invested in the railways of the United States earned last year an average of only 3.4 per cent., and of this amount the capital stock, representing the ownership, received an average of less than 1 per cent.

There can be no doubt that every branch of industry in the country, if the subject were carefully and dispassionately considered, would declare in favor of railway peace, and the security of uniform, stable, and reasonable rates. The one million of railway employees are the first to suffer from the poverty of railways, either in reduction of wages or loss of occupation. The very large commercial industry which deals in railway supplies is quick to feel a diminution in the purchasing power by the companies. The travelling public soon takes alarm at the accidents that multiply rapidly upon poverty-stricken lines which have not the means of properly maintaining their roadways and equipment. The general markets both here and abroad are very sensitive to anything which affects railway earnings, and the financial depressions which occur when railways suffer affect every branch of business.

In talking with intelligent men in London, Paris, Amsterdam, and Frankfort, I have found but one expression of opinion, which is to the effect that if the railways of the United States could secure stable and reasonable rates, and follow the example of England and other countries in putting a stop to railway wars, the favorite investment of all European capitalists would be American railway securities. Such a result would start a flow of

money to the United States which would give a new impulse to every kind of trade.

The shipper would unquestionably derive the most important and immediate benefit from a policy which would put an end to rate wars. At the present time he is forced to be a gambler in rates, just as importing merchants were compelled to be gamblers in gold before the return to specie payments, when the price of that metal was subject to daily fluctuations. He realizes the enormous outlay entailed upon railways in the payment of commissions and rebates, and in maintaining outside agencies with numerous expensive offices, and he knows that any plan which would abolish these, insure permanent and reasonable rates, and so improve the credit of railway companies as to enable them to procure money on better terms, would bring about large savings, and that he would naturally share to some extent the economies thus effected. He cares very little how this result is brought about, so long as he secures first-class service at reasonably low rates, and is absolutely assured that such rates will be public, uniform, and permanent, and that it will be impossible for his rivals to obtain any advantage over him through discrimination.

The practical question which this leads up to is the remedy. Before the passage of the Inter-State-Commerce Law the simplest means was pooling upon the basis of agreed percentages of business by the several competing roads and the evening-up by the diversion of traffic or payment in money to the roads which failed to carry their proportion of the tonnage. The principal defect was that this arrangement was not of such a nature as to be binding in law, and the penalties provided could not be enforced.

An immediate relief could be afforded by an amendment to the Inter-State-Commerce Law authorizing pooling, provided it be conducted under the direct supervision of the Inter-State-Commerce Commissioners. Under such an arrangement there would be an assurance of permanency and stability in rates among the active competing lines, and while the present tariffs, by far the lowest in the world, might not be advanced, the railways could introduce so many economies, and dispense with so much of the present expensive and complicated machinery for obtaining business, that their savings in this respect would insure

a reasonable profit. A bill providing for this was introduced in the Senate of the last Congress. It seemed to meet with considerable favor, but the adjournment was reached before the measure was brought to a vote.

It is hard to imagine that any intelligent shipper in the country could raise a valid objection to such an amendment. The objection on the part of railways might be that it would stimulate the building of more competing roads by encouraging the promoters of such enterprises to believe that upon the completion of the new lines they would be admitted to the pool; but no remedy can be found which would not have some disadvantages.

There are persons who believe that the necessities of the case will lead Congress to proceed still further under the constitutional provision giving it the right to "regulate commerce among the several States," and that it will extend its sole authority over all the railways, and at least end the unfortunate conflict between national and State regulation. It is contended that, if Congress has the right to regulate the transit of a box of goods carried through the States, it may claim the right to regulate the means of transportation by which the box is carried—that is, the railway systems of the country. The extraordinary scope which has already been claimed for this constitutional provision prepares us for almost any interpretation of it. The framers of the constitution undoubtedly intended it as a means of protection to the channels of through commerce, fearing that the States might attempt to swell their revenues by imposing transit duties upon business passing through their territory. But this very wise and necessary constitutional provision is now made a pretext for imposing upon the channels of through commerce onerous restrictions, which are a source of embarrassment instead of protection. In assuming the sole right to regulate the railway systems, Congress would be met by the fact that most of the railway companies are organized under State charters; but it might perhaps overcome this difficulty by granting them national charters. On the question of regulating our great channels of commerce Congress is now astride of the fence, and it would be a relief to all parties in interest to have it get down on one side or the other.

The remedy which is resorted to at present for steadying the rates is that which is effected by the formation of traffic associations composed of competing lines. These have brought the railway

officers together in joint meetings, have cultivated a more friendly feeling among them, and have led to joint traffic agreements which have been of benefit both to the roads and the shippers in many ways. The inherent difficulties and disadvantages of the method are the following: It is generally impossible to have all the competing lines enter the association, and the one which remains outside is independent as to the fixing of rates, and practically has a "call" on the business; traffic has to be equalized by the granting of "differentials," the distribution of tonnage, and the evening-up of passenger business by trying to divert it at times to particular lines; the companies retain their distinct individuality, and no comprehensive arrangement can be made for a common use of cars in order to divert them to certain lines at different seasons according to the exigencies of the service created by the moving of the different crops; the association being liable to termination upon comparatively short notice, the roads do not feel justified in abandoning their numerous outside agencies and expensive machinery for obtaining business, knowing that there would be great difficulty in reëstablishing them in case of the dissolution of the association. Attempts have been made to strengthen such organizations by making more stringent provision for penalties, extending the life of the association for a term of years without the power to terminate it sooner, and agreeing upon a joint agent at each of the principal competing points, with full authority to distribute the business as nearly as may be upon agreed percentages; but such action has thus far been deemed too radical to secure the approval of a sufficient number of the parties in interest.

It has also been proposed to unite the boards of the several roads in the association into a congress of boards, such congress in joint meeting to dictate the policy of the several roads and appoint all their officers.

A plan which is meeting with much favor at present is the proposition to create a joint ownership by forming a parent corporation, which by purchase or exchange of stocks shall become the proprietor of the association roads. Such a plan would secure the economies which are always brought about by the wholesale as against the retail method of doing business, and would be a much more effective cure for existing evils than the temporary methods which have thus far been put in practice. It is a no-

ticeable fact that the tendency towards common ownership or consolidation is increasing, and that the difficulties with which railways have been surrounded are gradually forcing this remedy upon them as a measure of self-protection. At every important meeting of an association more potent methods are adopted, and each year finds an increased number of roads absorbed by others.

There is much encouragement to be derived from the rapidly-increasing traffic of the country, the better prices now received by crop-growers, the decrease in competitive railway construction, and the conservatism which will be brought about through investments in railway securities by the people of those States in which few of such securities are now held.

With a proper exercise of the large experience and recognized ability possessed by railway managers, and public discussions which will lead to a better knowledge of the subject, there are good reasons to believe that a better understanding will be reached between legislators, shippers, and railway companies, and that methods will be introduced which will be for the good of all and end the possibilities of further warfare. If unremunerative rates are forced upon the railways, they will unquestionably lead to a deterioration of the service and the impossibility of raising money to build necessary extensions and create new roads. Capital, which furnishes the sinews of all business, will shun localities which render investments unprofitable, disbursements will be smaller, the purchasing power of customers will be reduced, and every branch of trade will feel the evil effects. It is a sound axiom that whatever injures a part injures the whole, and no one great industry of the country can suffer without others suffering in some degree. The moral of the ancient fable is very pertinent to this case: when the limbs entered upon a warfare against the stomach and refused to contribute their share to its support, their enfeebled condition, which resulted from its inability to nourish them, soon brought them to a realizing sense of the value of the principle of mutual assistance.

HORACE PORTER.

THE WORKINGMAN AND FREE SILVER.

BY T. V. POWDERLY, GENERAL MASTER WORKMAN OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR.

THE mechanic and the laborer are as deeply interested in the free coinage of silver as the farmer can possibly be. The latter, it is true, owns more of the earth's surface, but, after all, he can extract from it only a living; the mechanic and the laborer are entitled to as much, if they earn it, and at death all will take leave of earth on an equality, so far as being burdened with the care of baggage or property *en route* to eternity is concerned. In earning a livelihood and in paying as they go, all are equally concerned in the medium of exchange which enables the agriculturist to purchase the machinery and tools he requires and affords the laborer the means of procuring the products of the farm as an exchange for the labor expended on the machinery and tools aforesaid. The workman of the city or town, who has no capital save his labor, sets as much store by that labor as does the farmer by his farm or the millionaire by his millions; it is his all, and should he be deprived of the right or power to exercise it, he would have lost his all. No man could lose more, no matter how wealthy he might be.

To the laborer, then, the currency question is as important as to any man in the land. If the currency is so costly, intrinsically, that but few can afford to possess a great deal of it, or if the material of which it is made is subject to speculative traffic, the opportunities to secure steady employment will vary in proportion to the fluctuations in the price of the commodity of which the money is made. If it will yield a greater profit to sell silver or gold as a commodity than to invest it, as money, in the building, stock, and machinery of a factory, it will be sold as a commodity.

If the workman of the city could hold his labor in the hollow of his hand and regard it as a tangible, real possession, something that he could hold to await an advance in price or value, he would set more store by it than he does, and he would part with it more reluctantly than at present. The farmer enters more deeply into the act of selling and buying; he is found more intimately concerned in the regulation of market prices than the city workman, and, as a natural result, takes keener interest in anything that enters into the regulation of prices. The farmer has been heard on the silver question; and the city workman, although he has not spoken out on the subject, holds views identical with those of his neighbor on the farm. So far as the laborer is concerned, he could get along very well if there were no gold or silver. He did exist and prosper during and after the Civil War, seventeen years in all, without feasting his eyes on a piece of gold or silver coin. It may be said of the laborer that he is in favor of a circulating medium that will be a full legal-tender for all debts public and private, the same to be issued by his government, as authorized by the constitution of the United States, without the intervention of any banking concern whatever. As to the material of which this money shall be composed, he is not particular except so far that it shall not be of a material that may be monopolized and withdrawn from circulation through war, panic, or speculation. He receives his earnings at the end of each month or week, and never complains that the money paid him rarely contains either silver or gold; he is not disturbed in mind because it is composed entirely of paper, except the fractional part, which is in silver that is of a less intrinsic value than the silver dollar was or will be; and he never hears any complaint from Americans because of the inferior quality of this fractional currency.

Object-lessons are the best, it is said, and what he witnesses every day cannot fail to leave its impress upon his mind. He saw a nation pass through the throes of a civil war equalled in bitterness and fury by none; he saw the hard money of the nation, or, rather, the hard-money men of the nation take themselves to Europe for safety, and on the strength of their hard cash attempt to loan money to this government—not gold and silver, but paper, at rates of interest ranging from 10 to 33 per cent.; he saw a patriot President stand up between the nation and the usurers in a demand

upon Congress to issue a full legal-tender paper currency; he saw $60,000,000 of a full legal-tender paper currency circulate until children old enough to read of the war that had ended, and who had never seen a piece of gold or silver money, were told that years ago gold and silver were money, but were no longer used as such. Then in Congress, at the behest of the owners of gold, silver was secretly and stealthily demonetized. This the laborer did not see, nor the President who signed the bill; and within the last few months statesmen who were Senators and Congressmen in 1873, when the demonetization of silver was accomplished, have admitted voting for the bill without knowing that it contained the demonetization clause. One statesman has not denied a knowledge of that act of treachery to the people—John Sherman—and he is to-day the subject of adverse criticism by nearly every living man who sat with him in the Senate when that bill was adopted without question, on his word that it contained nothing that interfered with the coinage of the silver dollar. Gold is the legal standard to-day because the bankers, brokers, and gold-owners of the world influenced Congress to make it so; the people never demanded it, never uttered a sentiment that could be construed in favor of monometallism, never petitioned Congress or a Congressman to pass such a law. It was done when a bill, with sixty-seven sections, as long as the moral law, was under discussion, and was passed through Congress without question, because that body had faith in the honor of a committee of three of which Mr. Sherman was chairman.

It could not have been the American needs of finance that urged Congress to demonetize silver, for neither gold nor silver had been in circulation for years. The enactments of July 17, 1861, and February 12, 1862, authorized the issue of $60,000,000 treasury notes that were a full legal-tender, without exception, for all debts, dues, and demands. Within a week after the adoption of this last act the bankers of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia held a convention in Washington, and resolved to protest against the government issuing the currency directly to the people. If a full legal-tender paper money should continue to issue to the people, there would be no further demand for gold, and *Shylock* would be cheated out of his pound of flesh. The result of the deliberations of that convention were made known to the country when Congress, on the 25th of February, 1862, passed an act which declared

that the greenback should be a "legal-tender for all debts, public and private, except duties on imports and interest on the public debt," which from that time on should be paid in coin. The adoption of that act, known as the "exception-clause act," created a demand for a metallic money. Gold and silver had been withdrawn from circulation, and for years after the Civil War were known as money only in the resorts of the money-changers. Shortly after the ending of the Civil War the resumption of specie payments began to be agitated, and if that should come to pass, with gold and silver standing on the same ground of equality which they had occupied from the founding of the government, the bondholder would have to accept the interest accruing on his bonds in coin of either metal. A bill to revise the laws relating to the mints was adopted by Congress early in 1873, and in it was concealed the clause which demonetized the silver dollar and gave the gold the monopoly. Then came the Resumption Act of January 24, 1875, and from that time forward the interest on the public debt must be paid in gold. The public debt at the time the Demonetization Act was passed was $2,234,482,993.20. The Resumption Act did not intend that those who earned money through labor should be paid in specie; its intent was to pay the bondholder a different kind of money from that with which he purchased his bonds, and as the principal and interest of that debt must be paid by labor or not at all, it will be seen that the burden has fallen upon the shoulders of those who labor in the United States. The difference of half a billion of dollars on the principal, and the interest on the whole ever since 1873, coming from the sweat of the mechanic and the laborer, ought to cause him to take an interest in the free coinage of silver.

The term "free and unlimited coinage of silver" is misunderstood. Many believe it to mean that everything in the shape of silver, bullion or otherwise, will at once be coined in unlimited quantities and thrown on the street. Only those who have silver to coin will take it to the mint, and only those who earn it will or should legally be permitted to possess it. "But then foreigners will send their silver here to be coined if it is free, and that will give us too much money," is another cry. If a dollar's worth of silver comes from across the water, a dollar's worth of some American product will be exchanged for it, unless the foreigner is reckless enough to send his bullion for nothing. If he

does, we are the gainers. If he desires to coin his silver into American dollars, they must circulate here and pay for labor and commodities here; for as soon as they go abroad they must go through the crucible and appear in another form, as the money of another nation; and gold must do exactly the same. Every argument that has been or will be used against silver can with equal force be directed against gold, for there is no such thing as "money of the world." We see no foreign coin in circulation here. There is no American coin in circulation in any other country. The fact that both gold and silver are susceptible of so many currency changes causes the workman to believe that paper is the best material of which to make money; it is cheap, it cannot be monopolized, it cannot be melted into coin of another nation, and if it goes abroad it will, like a true American, come home; not that alone, but it will come home in payment for the product of American labor. Should war invade our domain, a paper currency would not play the coward's part, as did gold and silver in 1861, and flee from us; no man could turn it into anything that he could take out of the country to our injury.

The cry that "we will have too much money if silver is remonetized and made the equal of gold" is unworthy of consideration. No nation ever yet complained of having too much money or suffered through that cause. Hard times and panics are due to contractions and not expansions of the currency. Contraction of the currency is not possible where the government itself, acting under its constitutional right, issues the currency directly to the people without the intervention of individuals or corporations. There will be more money in the hands of the people, in bona-fide circulation, if free coinage of silver is restored to where it was up to 1873. We are warned against interfering with vested rights by those who object to free coinage. From 1792 up to 1873, a period of eighty-one years, silver stood side by side with gold as the constitutional money of the United States. The right of silver was a vested right in 1873. No party platform or demand from the people called for its debasement by Congress. It was not because silver was less valuable than gold that it was demonetized, for at the passage of that act it was worth three cents more than gold. All legal decisions and precedents are against that act of Congress; it was not demanded by the people, has never been approved by them, and cannot be defended from any other standpoint

than as an act stealthily perpetrated in the interest of the power that controlled gold, or that hoped to control the nation through the use of gold. It was to make money scarce that the act was passed, and it succeeded. If anything in existing circumstances warranted the belief even that the volume of gold would be sufficient to transact the business of the nation, there would have been an excuse for the action of Congress, but such was not the case.

The total production of gold in the United States in 1890 was valued at $32,800,000. I do not know what percentage of that amount is consumed in the fine arts and in the jewelry trade, but it is safe to assume that at least one-half will be devoted to these uses, leaving about one-half, or $16,400,000, for use at the mints. The total volume of currency as given in official reports last year, including gold, silver, and paper, was $2,096,344,895. Of that amount $634,010,285 was gold, $458,134,057 silver, and $1,004,200,553 was made up of the different issues of paper currency. With less than a third of the currency composed of gold, and a total of over two billions of dollars required for use each year, it is simply impossible for gold to constitute an equitable or honest basis for our currency. It must not be forgotten that less than $295,806,831 of the gold coin was in actual circulation; but if we add to that the gold certificates, amounting to $57,862,759, we would then have only $353,669,590 of gold and its representatives in actual circulation. With a population of 62,000,000 people in the United States, we have but a fraction over six dollars per capita of gold in circulation; and with gold as the basis, with the law in existence which authorizes the citizen to demand gold, we find ourselves at the mercy of cliques, rings, and cabals, if they should conspire to ruin our credit as a nation. Three citizens of the United States, Jay Gould, William Waldorf Astor, and John D. Rockefeller, own a combined total of $360,000,000; over six millions more than the actual circulation of gold coin in the United States. If we are to regard gold as the basis on which our currency is to rest, as at present, the three men named have it in their power to withdraw every gold dollar from circulation without any warning or notice whatever; they may absorb and carry out of the country the basis of our national currency, and do it under authority of law.

The census returns estimate the wealth of the nation at

$1,000 per capita, and with gold as the basis each $1,000 worth of property must be represented by a fraction over six dollars in gold. It is necessary that we have a basis or measure of values, and if gold is to perform that function, those who are wealthy enough to corner gold may corner the nation itself if they desire. The workman's home may be worth from one to five thousand dollars; but the moment the gold gamblers begin to call in the money made of that metal, the mines and workshops will shut down or go on short time, and he has to mortgage his home in order to live. This could not be done with the currency of the nation composed of gold, silver, and paper based upon the faith and resources of the nation and circulating as legal-tender for all debts public and private. The workman is therefore in favor of silver, for it is a step toward supplying the country with a sufficient volume of money to transact the business of the same. A circulating medium based upon the resources of the nation is not so easily tampered with as one based upon gold; it is safer and more patriotic; besides it is not so easy to take $1,000 worth of property out of the country as it is to carry six gold dollars beyond the border of the seas.

"But we want a currency that is redeemable; our paper money is no good in Europe and we cannot use it there," is another argument against silver and paper. Those who repeat that cry oftenest never go to Europe, never deal with any person, corporation, or firm located there, and never have any use for the "money of the world," as they put it. A man may own a million dollars in gold and give his note for $10, and if he has no real estate in this nation his note is not redeemable, and the furthest the debtor can go toward collecting the bill will be to get judgment against him. That judgment will be worthless while the man against whom it issues is the possessor of no real estate in the United States.

With gold as the alleged basis our currency is irredeemable in that metal, and as years grow upon us it will become more so, for the total annual output of gold of the entire world, $121,162,009, is not sufficient to supply this nation alone with a circulating medium sufficient for all demands of the people. The statement that gold furnishes a safe basis is a delusion and a snare. A resolve upon the part of the people to demand gold as payment of one day's labor or business would burst the

bubble. The circulating medium of this nation is in reality based upon the faith of the people, and nothing in the shape of gold sustains it. Every time a man buys a dollar's worth of meat or flour he redeems the dollar he expends. He need not question the future of that dollar; it has served its purpose with him and that is sufficient; in fact, that is all that money is intended to do, or can do, for it is intended to represent value and need not be, of itself, intrinsically valuable. The redemption is not in exchanging one kind of dollar for another, but in getting pay for the dollar in food or clothing.

"If free and unlimited coinage is restored, it will benefit the owners of silver mines and give us an eighty-cent dollar to circulate with the gold dollar," is another fear entertained. Such an argument applies with equal force against the use of gold, for our present system gives the owners of gold mines a monopoly over all others. The monopoly enjoyed by gold employs but little labor in comparison with what would be employed if silver were admitted to free coinage: a stimulus would be given to labor in the West, and the prosperity of that part of the country could not possibly have a bad effect on the East. In any event, to ask for free coinage is not the heretical demand the apologists for gold would have us believe, for it is only a demand for what we had and enjoyed from the founding of the republic up to 1873. Shall we have an eighty-cent dollar running neck and neck with one containing one hundred cents? Remonetize silver, and it becomes as legitimately a dollar as is gold; the sliding scale which is expressly provided may at all times determine the ratio between the two coins, and, once remonetized, the commodity value of silver will cease to exist.

In no market has gold a commodity value to-day; it is not quoted anywhere as a commodity, simply because it has been admitted to free coinage as money. Pokers are made of iron, but once forged into pokers they are no longer quoted as iron and are used as pokers until necessity shall demand a change, when they may be forged into fence railings or something else. While they are pokers they are valued only as pokers and nothing else, and a gold poker or a silver poker will have no more value as a poker than an iron one. There will be this difference, however: there will always be more of a temptation to hide the gold and silver pokers away than those made of iron, and as a consequence the

iron ones will be most reliable for every-day use until a cheaper and equally durable metal is discovered, when iron will have to give way. What is true of pokers is true of currency; the material should not be too costly or difficult to produce.

The mechanic and the laborer favor the free coinage of silver only as a step forward, for they believe enough money should circulate to do the business of the nation ; and when money can be made of paper that will be as difficult to counterfeit, as safe and reliable in every way, and, above all, of material so cheap that the government, of which they are a part, will not have to pay exorbitant prices to gold and silver miners, they believe that Congress should do in 1892 what it did in 1862—issue a full legal-tender paper dollar based upon the only thing that can make money really valuable, the faith and resources of this go-ahead nation.

T. V. POWDERLY.

THE QUORUM IN EUROPEAN LEGISLATURES.

BY THEODORE STANTON; WITH LETTERS FROM LOUIS RUCHONNET, EX-PRESIDENT OF THE SWISS CONFEDERATION; PRESIDENT VON LEVETZOW, OF THE GERMAN REICHSTAG; HENRI BRISSON, JULES MÉLINE, SOFUS HÖGSBRO, PRESIDENT OF THE DANISH FOLKETHING; A. CHIAVASSA, OF THE ITALIAN SENATE, AND OTHERS.

THE position taken by Speaker Reed in the last Congress concerning the manner of counting a quorum in the House of Representatives renders interesting a glance at the way the same question is treated by the legislative bodies of Continental Europe. I have examined the subject with some care, and have put myself in communication with leading politicians and the presiding officers of political assemblies in several Continental countries. The result of my inquiries is both curious and instructive.

As in art, literature, and civil liberty, so in this matter of the legislative quorum, the influence of France has been felt in all parts of Continental Europe. The word quorum came into France from England, but the French have always taken its meaning in a much more restricted sense than that given to it by the House of Commons. But in the beginning the number of members necessary to constitute a quorum was much smaller than it is to-day. In the first Constituent Assembly, composed of 1,145 members, 200 made a quorum, or, rather, it was necessary simply that 200 deputies be "present" at the moment when the house was called to order. The constitution of September 14, 1791, stated that the legislative body, composed of 745 members, might not transact business unless "at least 200 deputies are present." It does not appear that the convention established any quorum. The rules of that body simply say that if, at the end of a sitting, less than 200 members are "present," any deputy may

demand that the roll be called. The Council of Ancients, with its 250 members, might not do business unless at least 126 deputies were "on the floor," while in the case of the Council of Five Hundred the "presence" of 200 members was required. During the consulate it was held by the constitution that "a legislative body may not transact business unless at least two-thirds of its members be present."

In proportion as parliamentary institutions developed in France under the Restoration and July Monarchy, the quorum question grew in importance, until what at first had been simply a matter of number became complicated by the manner of counting this number. The following interesting extracts from unpublished letters* to the author of this article bring out clearly the various aspects of this new phase of the quorum question in France.

M. Henri Brisson, who was president of the Chamber of Deputies for nearly four years, and afterwards Prime Minister, and who is a prominent deputy, writes :

"In France, the president of the Chamber has always held, at least in principle, that he had a right to count, in order to obtain a quorum, the deputies present at the moment a ballot was taken, *whether they voted or not.*† The putting into practice of this principle is attended with certain difficulties. However, I think I have seen M. Grévy exercise this right. I consider it incontestable even when not incorporated in the rules. But the difficulty is generally got around in this fashion : Our rules contain an article to the effect that, in case no quorum is present, a vote on the question under discussion will be called for at the next sitting, when the result will be valid whatever may be the number of deputies who take part in the ballot. So the president orders a vote, declares there is not a quorum, adjourns the sitting, calls the house to order again at the end of ten minutes, and then orders a new vote, which this time becomes valid. This expedient is, like all expedients, useful ; but its value may be questioned. Looked at from a legal standpoint, I should prefer the solution recently adopted by the House of Representatives. I

* I may say that the letters which appear in this article were all written with a knowledge of and apropos of the discussion concerning the quorum question in the House of Representatives which has recently taken place in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

† The italics are M. Brisson's.

ought to add, however, that our procedure secures the end in view; by which I mean that it discourages and renders of very rare occurrence the manœuvre which it aims to check."

M. Jules Grévy, who was M. Carnot's predecessor in the Presidency, had a very wide experience in presiding over parliamentary bodies. During the Republic of 1848 he was vice-president of the Assembly. When the monarchical National Assembly met in 1871, M. Grévy, though a stanch Republican, was chosen as its president, which post he held for over two years. Again in 1876 he became president of the Chamber of Deputies, which office he held till elected Chief Magistrate in 1879. His son-in-law, M. Daniel Wilson, himself a prominent deputy for many years, wrote me recently as follows:

"I have spoken with M. Grévy about the subject which interests you. His opinion was that it was wise to decide that, when it is a question of a quorum, the members present on the floor should be counted *whether they vote or not.** In fact, a fraction of the house should not be permitted to paralyze, by refusing to answer the roll-call, all legislation. M. Henri Brisson is right when he tells you that M. Jules Grévy always considered that, in order to obtain a quorum, he could count as present, *whether they voted or not*, all members on the floor when the ballot was taken. M. Jules Grévy exercised this right, *with the approbation of the Bureau of the Chamber*,† not only once, but several times, while he occupied the presiding officer's chair."

M. Buffet, to-day a life-senator, was president of the National Assembly for nearly two years, between M. Grévy's two terms of office. He says on this same subject:

"It is certain, in the first place, that with us the quorum is decided by the number of *members present*,‡ and not by the number of those who vote. There is, however, one exception to this rule. An article of our constitution declares that the decisions of the Congress,§ united for the purpose of amending the constitution, are valid only when adopted by a majority of the total number of members belonging to the Congress. But in ordinary

* The italics are all M. Wilson's.

† The "Bureau" of the French Chamber of Deputies is composed of a president four vice-presidents, eight secretaries, and three questors or treasurers, elected by the deputies at the beginning of each session.

‡ The italics are M. Buffet's.

§ Composed of the Senate and Chamber of Deputies deliberating as one body.

cases a vote is valid when the number of *members present* exceeds one more than half of the membership of the body. I have always considered this figure, for the constitution of a quorum, excessive.

"Before a vote is taken, any member may call attention to the fact that there is not a quorum. If the president and the Bureau recognize the truth of the observation, the vote is of necessity postponed to the next sitting; but at this next sitting the ballot is valid, whatever may be the number of members present and voting. In practice it is very rare for a member to refer to this matter of a quorum. Many bills are carried by a rising and sitting vote in the presence of a house far smaller than that called for by the rules. When the vote is taken by means of cards, the quorum is established by the number of cards found in the baskets, although this number is often very much greater than the number of members present, on account of the very bad practice which prevails of voting for absent members.* This abuse may be checked, however, by calling the roll and requiring members to go up to the tribune to cast their vote."

M. Pierre, general secretary of the presidency of the Chamber of Deputies, is one of the greatest authorities in France on parliamentary law, and is the author of several works on the subject. "He is the depository of all the precedents," writes M. Buffet, "and, which is worth still more, the favorite pupil of M. Valette,† whom I consider, in the matter of parliamentary rules, as the law and the prophets." Here is what M. Pierre writes me:

"The numerous precedents given in my work ('Treatise on Parliamentary Law,' which I published some years ago) will show you that the decision of the United States House of Representatives is in conformity with our jurisprudence. The rules of the French Chamber of Deputies require, in order that a vote be valid, the *presence*‡ of one more than half of the legal number of the

* The common mode of voting in the French Senate and Chamber is by means of cards (*bulletins*). Each deputy or senator has two boxes of cards with his name printed on them. The white cards are affirmative; the blue ones negative. When the pages pass about the boxes (*urnes*), a member not only votes for himself, but may put into the box the cards of his friends who happen to be absent. The practice is indeed "very bad," for absent members are often made to cast a white card when, if present, they would have used a blue one, or *vice versâ*.

† A distinguished French jurist, member of the Institute and author of many able legal publications. He died in 1878.

‡ The italics are M. Pierre's.

full membership of the Chamber,—the *presence*, and *not the vote*. That is to say, if the necessary number of deputies is present in the chamber, but intentional absences reduce below the quorum the number of votes cast, the ballot is nevertheless declared to be valid. In this case, the Bureau must declare that, at the moment when the ballot was taken, one more than half of the representatives of the country were on the floor. This quorum question, as is shown by the precedents, has created frequent difficulties in France; so an article was recently added to the rules in order to meet the impossibility of balloting on account of the lack of a quorum. [M. Pierre then gives the remedy already mentioned by M. Brisson and M. Buffet.] In this way systematic absence is prevented."*

M. Jules Méline, ex-Minister of Agriculture, a prominent member of the present Chamber of Deputies, and president of that body two or three years ago, writes me as follows:

"If, when a ballot is to be taken, a deputy states that half of the members are not on the floor, the president is obliged to consult the Bureau; and if the Bureau is unanimous in declaring that a quorum is present, then the ballot is valid; but if the Bureau is divided on the question, a roll-call is ordered for the purpose of finding out how many deputies are really on the floor. But this proceeding is not so effective as it would seem; for as members cannot be forced to appear at the tribune † to deposit their ballots, the systematic absence of a certain number of members may put a stop to legislation even when a quorum is really present. During the last Chamber ‡ these tactics were frequently employed by the Monarchical and Boulangist opposition. But the rules have provided against this intentional obstruction, which otherwise might completely paralyze the parliamentary régime."

M. Méline then describes the expedient already explained by

* The advantages and disadvantages of the quorum in the French Chambers are given in full in M. Pierre's little pamphlet, entitled "La Procédure Parlementaire."

† *Le vote à la tribune et par appel nominal* is conducted in this way: One of the secretaries calls the roll, and each deputy, as his name is pronounced, goes up to the tribune, where the secretary gives him a ball (*une boule de contrôle*). He then deposits his card (*bulletin*) in the box placed on the tribune, and the ball in the box placed on the table of the secretaries. The secretaries, at the end of the ballot, count the cards and the balls, which must be equal in number. On each card is printed the name of the deputy who deposited it.

‡ The one ending in the summer of 1889, presided over by M. Méline.

M. Buffet and M. Brisson, of which, like the latter, he says: "It must be admitted that this proceeding is rather arbitrary." He then adds:

"It is by means of this ingenious expedient that the quorum difficulty is met and systematic obstruction prevented. But it must be confessed that thereby very little of the principle is left standing, and the question may well be asked whether its preservation is worth all this trouble. This device is fair and quite in conformity with the true aims of legislation. While it is evident that laws should always be made by the majority of the representatives of the country, it is also evident that these same representatives should do their duty. Coercive measures will always be found powerless to force them to perform this duty when they are determined to shirk it. There is something more important than the presence of the deputy at the moment when a ballot is to be taken; it is his being on the floor during the debate which leads up to the ballot. For my own part, I should accord much more authority to a law made by two hundred deputies who had carefully followed the debates concerning it than to a law passed in a hurry by five hundred deputies who had heard nothing about it. You will perceive, therefore, that I am, at bottom, quite sceptical as to the advantages of the famous quorum. I would be more ready, it is true, to admit the principle into legislative bodies where the opposition is small, and so unable to use it as an instrument of war against the majority."

After France—perhaps I should say before France—the Continental nation which has had the most experience in legislative procedure is, doubtless, Switzerland. M. Louis Ruchonnet, President of the Confederation when these lines were written, says:*

"The recent decision of the United States House of Representatives conforms to Swiss procedure. With us, each chamber may deliberate legally when one more than half of the members are present. But every ballot is binding when it is a majority of those *voting*. It is not necessary, therefore, that the majority consist of one more than half of the membership of the Council, nor even one more than half of the members necessary to form a quorum. Let me illustrate. The Council of States (*Conseil des*

*M. Ruchonnet is now Minister of Justice and Police in the Swiss Federal Council, or Cabinet as we should say.

*États**) is made up of forty-four members. Its proceedings are legal if twenty-three members are present. If a ballot is taken, and eight members, for instance, vote aye and four no, and eleven do not vote at all, the ballot is valid and the Council has voted in the affirmative. In the National Council (*Conseil National* †) a two-thirds' vote of the members present is necessary in order to cut off further debate on a question before the house.

"Here is the way by which it is decided whether either house contains a quorum or no: At the hour fixed for opening the sitting, the secretary calls the roll. If the number of members answering to their names exceeds one-half of the total membership, there is a quorum, and the president declares the house to be ready for business. If this be not the case, no business can be transacted. If, during a sitting, the president or a member finds that there is not a quorum present, the roll is again called; but if nobody directs attention to the fact, business is often transacted without there being a quorum."

In the Belgian Chamber of Representatives, I learn from the rules, a *liste de présence* is placed at the disposition of the members, a half-hour before the sitting begins, in order that they may sign it. When it is time to call the house to order, the president glances at the list, and orders the roll to be called for those who have not signed. If there is still no quorum, the house is adjourned to one of the four succeeding days, and the list of members present and absent is published in full in the *Annales Parlementaires*, which corresponds to our *Congressional Record*. Every member present who is on the floor at the moment a ballot is taken, but who does not vote, will be invited ("*sera invité*," Art. 29 of the rules reads) by the president, after the roll-call, to give his reasons for not voting. The president, M. de Lantsheere, writes me:

"The question of the quorum in the Belgian house is regulated by the rules. In practice, the president generally opens the sitting without paying attention to the number of members who have signed the *liste de présence*. Many members do not themselves sign the list; their names are noted by a page. The roll-call at the opening of a sitting is resorted to in order to find out who are absent, and whose names shall be published in the

* Corresponding to the United States Senate.
† Corresponding to the American House of Representatives.

Annales, rather than to learn how many members are on the floor. This preliminary roll-call is considered a measure *de rigueur*. Otherwise the president never has recourse to it, except when absenteeism becomes too general and persistent. If he lets it be known that he intends to have the roll called, the announcement is generally sufficient to bring absent members upon the floor.

"Every member present on the floor of the house when a ballot is taken is obliged to take part in it. If a member will vote neither aye nor no, he is required to state the reason of his course. If half plus one of the members composing the body do not vote, the president adjourns the house, and this ballot is placed first on the order of business of the next sitting. In determining the number of members present, all are counted—those who vote negatively and affirmatively and those who decline to vote.

"The measure adopted in the United States is, therefore, practised in Belgium. I do not recall that it has given rise to any criticism. It acts only as a very mediocre bar against obstruction. It is always easy to quit the floor. On various occasions the opposition have done this; when a ballot was to be taken, they have left the house, and so made it impossible to transact business. It even once happened that the whole opposition refused to appear at a sitting, when it was known that the majority, on account of the forced absence of some of its members, could not form a quorum. On the other hand, there have been instances where members of the majority have left the floor in order to prevent a vote hostile to the cabinet.

"The rules of the Senate governing this matter do not differ materially from those of the House. In fact, this view may be said to have become a part of the common law of Belgium, for the law of May 18, 1874, concerning commercial corporations, declares (Art. 61) that at a general meeting of stockholders, in default of a by-law governing any particular case which may arise, recourse will be had to the ordinary rules governing deliberative bodies."

The president of the Danish Folkething, or Lower House, Mr. Sofus Högsbro writes me:

"According to Article 61 of the present constitution of Denmark, 'neither of the two houses may sit unless more than half of the members are present and vote.' But it has long been the custom for members who reply, when the roll is called, 'I do not

vote,' to be counted as present, and consequently to contribute to the formation of the quorum, notwithstanding their non-participation in the ballot. In cases of urgency, it is sometimes desired to suspend the rules of the house, which is permitted by Article 44, 'provided that no constitutional stipulations are affected thereby.' For this purpose, the majority must consist of three-quarters 'of those voting.' In such a case, I, as president of the chamber, consider it my duty to apply a more strict interpretation of the rules, and I do not permit members who reply, when their names are called, 'I do not vote,' to be counted among those who take part in the ballot. When, on March 28, 1890, a deputy protested against this interpretation (see the 'Proceedings of the Chamber,' p. 4,465), I answered that it was necessary to make a distinction between the quorum competent to debate a proposition and the quorum competent to vote the same proposition. For this latter purpose, in this matter of the suspension of the rules, only those may be counted for the constitution of a quorum who actually take part in the ballot by voting aye or no."

The president of the Dutch Chamber writes me:

"In the Netherlands the question which has agitated the Congress of the United States could not arise, for, according to the rules of our house, the sitting begins as soon as the absolute majority of the legal number of deputies is present. This same majority is necessary in order that a ballot may be valid. A single member may demand the ayes and noes, and then every member present is forced to answer to his name by saying *voor* (aye) or *tegen* (no)."

When I asked Mr. Beelaerts van Blohle what he would do if a member refused to answer when his name was called, I received this reply:

"Such a case is not provided for, and I cannot imagine that there could be any reason for a member to act in that way, as he would be openly defying the explicit rules of the house. The doors of the house always being open, members who do not wish to answer at roll-call have simply to retire. They are required to vote only when they are present."

It is evident that the minority in the Dutch Chamber is either very small or very docile.

M. Rodrigues de Freitas, who, a number of years ago, was the first Republican deputy to enter the Portuguese Chamber of

Deputies, and who was again a deputy last winter, writes me as follows from Oporto:

"Article 54 of the rules of the Portuguese Chamber of Deputies (law of March 22, 1876) reads as follows: 'No deputy may be excused from voting if he is present at the moment when the ballot commences.' One of the provisions in the rules of the House of Lords (law of April 20, 1843) is to the same effect. Our Administrative Code of July 27, 1886, contains a similar clause. The quorum consists of at least one-third of the total membership of the house. But on March 12 and 15, 1884, the Chamber of Deputies decided that the sitting could begin if only one-quarter of the members were present, and that this quorum was sufficient to pass on the minutes of the previous sitting, to listen to reports, and to debate bills, but not to vote them. In the House of Lords nineteen members constitute a quorum; but, when only nineteen members are on the floor, it requires fifteen ayes to pass a measure. If more than nineteen peers are on the floor, then a majority of those present will suffice to pass a bill.

"Sometimes deputies leave the house when a ballot is about to be taken; but often they remain, taking no part in the ballot, notwithstanding the rule which prohibits this course. But in this case they are not counted for the purpose of making a quorum. There are even instances where, in a ballot by roll-call, members present on the floor have declined to vote and yet were considered as absent by the president, although their non-participation in the ballot destroyed the quorum. You perceive, therefore, that the question of 'those who do not vote' has not been raised in Portugal. In fact, it strikes me as rather odd that, in order to obtain a quorum, a member is counted when he does not vote. It is much as if a piece of wood or a statue could, *per interim*, be a representative of the people." *

The following bit of rather curious information comes to me from Christiania, from Mr. H. E. Berner, the well-known member of the Storthing, or Lower House, of Norway. He says:

"Article 73 of our constitution requires the presence of at least two-thirds of the deputies, and Article 13 of the law of July 7, 1828, concerning the responsibilities of deputies, punishes

* In a postscript to his letter M. de Freitas says: "This information is furnished me by the most competent authority on this subject, Baron de St. Clement, honorary director of the stenographers' bureau of the Chamber and author of several works on the history of the Portuguese Parliament.

with a fine of from 400 to 4,000 crowns * members who absent themselves from the chamber. Article 24 of the rules of the house, revised in 1890, is still more precise in this matter. You perceive, therefore, that our deputies are required to attend the sittings of the chamber and to take part in the ballots. Obstruction by a minority, whether by leaving the house or by not voting when on the floor, would be impossible in the Norwegian Parliament."

In answer to my inquiries, Herr von Levetzow, president of the German Reichstag, writes :

"Article 28 of the Imperial Constitution declares that a majority of the lawful membership of the Diet must be present in order that laws may be passed. At the beginning of each sitting the roll is called for the purpose of knowing whether a *quorum* is present. Whenever, in the course of the sitting, there is reason to doubt the presence of the necessary number of members, the roll is again called, as is prescribed by Article 54 of our rules. If it is found that less than 199 members are present, no business may be transacted and the Reichstag adjourns. If during this roll-call it should happen that a member present on the floor does not respond to his name, he would undoubtedly be counted with the other members if noticed by the functionaries ; but the rules of the Reichstag contain no provision for a case of this kind." †

Mr. Olof Wijk, formerly president of the Second Chamber of the Swedish Diet, sends me the following information from his home at Gothenburg :

"No quorum is necessary for the transaction of business in either of the two chambers of the Swedish Diet. The proceedings in the chambers may not be brought to a close so long as there is any member who wishes to address the house on the question under discussion. All that can be done is adjourn the debate

* That is, from about $110 to about $1,110.

† Baron Georg von Bunsen, once a prominent member of the Reichstag, sends me the following additional information concerning the manner of voting in that body :

"Our quorum consists of one more than half of the legal number of members. The latter being, in the case of the Reichstag, 397, its quorum is 199. A vote is taken either by members rising in their seats, or by members retiring into the lobby, thence to reënter by different doors, or by all members present answering *yea* or *nay* when their names are called in alphabetical order. It may interest you to know that about twenty-six years ago Werner Siemens, the great electrician, offered the House of [Prussian] Representatives, of which he was then a member, an electric apparatus by which the votes of all present could be taken and shown instantaneously. This admirable offer, which was of course gratis, was rejected."

to another day. However, the Diet has never been troubled by 'obstruction,' although discussions may often have been prolonged more than was strictly necessary on account of the desire of members to let their constituents know the views of their representatives on important questions; for, as the ballot is secret in our Diet, the vote is not published. I may add that there is no way by which members can be forced to vote if they decline to do so."

Signor A. Chiavassa, director of the *Chancellerie* of the Italian Senate, writes in the name of the president, Chevalier Farini, as follows:

"The quorum required in our Parliament is determined by Article 53 of the fundamental statute of the kingdom, which reads as follows: 'The sittings and deliberations of the chambers are neither legal nor valid unless an absolute majority of their members be present.' Up to the present time the question has not been raised as to how the quorum shall be determined, so that the Senate has not been called upon to pronounce on this matter."

Accompanying Signor Chiavassa's letter are the printed rules of the Senate. Article 35 states that when a member directs the president's attention to the fact that there is no quorum, a roll-call is ordered. Then comes this paragraph: "All the members present are counted in making up the legal number"—that is, the quorum "necessary to give validity to measures which are carried by a majority vote of those taking part in the ballot."

I am informed that the rules of the Italian Chamber do not differ materially from those of the Senate. "It has become customary," writes my informant, "to multiply infinitely the number of regular leaves of absence, so that it may be easier to obtain a quorum."

The information which I have been able to obtain from several other countries is either incomplete* or adds nothing new to the facts already given. Examined with a view to its bearing on the recent action in the House of Representatives, one finds that Continental procedure favors, on the whole, the view taken by Speaker Reed. In France, where parliamentary

*The president of the Austrian Chamber of Deputies writes that "one hundred members constitute the quorum, and the secretaries count to see if that number is present."

institutions are more highly developed than in any other European country, with the exception of England perhaps, the testimony of such able presiding officers as the ex-presidents of the Chamber of Deputies, whose letters have been given, is of special weight ; and it has been seen that Messrs. Grévy, Buffet, Brisson, and Méline, as well as M. Pierre, all agree as to the wisdom and justice of Speaker Reed's course.

Nor is it in France alone that the quorum difficulty has been met in much the same way as in Washington. In Norway we see members forced by a pecuniary fine to attend sittings and to take part in the ballots, while in the sister kingdom, Sweden, the obstacle is avoided by having no quorum. In Portugal the number required to constitute a quorum is very low,—one-third, and, in some cases, even one-quarter of the members,—while the rules of both the Chamber and the House of Lords require members to vote, although this article does not appear to be enforced by the presiding officer. In Denmark President Högsbro counts non-voters as present on the floor ; and in Germany Herr von Levetzow would be inclined to do the same thing if circumstances required it. The presiding officer of the Belgian Chamber of Representatives has evidently encountered many of the same difficulties as those which lately beset Speaker Reed, and has surmounted them in a somewhat similar manner, backed by stringent rules. In Switzerland, too, legislation is not paralyzed by non-participation in the balloting, while one of the rules of the Italian Parliament reads very much like the measure which a few months ago caused such bitter discussion in the House of Representatives and in the public prints. At The Hague alone the perplexing quorum problem does not seem to have yet disturbed the proverbial placidity of the Dutch.

THEODORE STANTON.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

FOOT-BALL: SPORT AND TRAINING.

A YOUNG student who has left home and a parent's watchful care, especially if the home be at some distance from a large city, arrives under the shades of the college he has chosen in a peculiar state of mind. In most cases a healthy, vigorous youth, he is full of life and spirits, and rather overfilled with his own new importance and freedom. He comes among three or four hundred like himself, young bucks who do not wish it to appear that they have come into any different atmosphere from that of the home circle. The first few months are times of hazing,—happily now almost extinct,—of the making of new acquaintances, and of introduction to new pleasures. Two or three hours a day must necessarily be given to recitations, but the rest of the time belongs to each student to use as he pleases for study or pleasure. Even the most exacting of parents would confess that some of this time should be given to relaxation.

Such a number of young bloods huddled together within a small area and full of animal spirits are apt to set each other on to actions that at another time would never enter one of their precious heads. It is all quite harmless and natural, and may never amount to anything more. Most of it has no unfortunate results in after life; some of it, indeed, is far better than mere acres of books that have no life or stimulus in them. But occasionally it hits some hopeful heir very hard, and it is such as he who give the university its bad name, if it has one.

The call for members and candidates for a foot-ball team, or for a dozen foot-ball teams, for a crew or a nine, is a very opportune thing at such a time, and the first-named sport issues its summons on registration day. It is difficult to realize, perhaps, how much wholesome restraint such an athletic sport exerts over new men at college, coming at the time when they are at their weakest; to realize how much influence the system of training the members of the team has over others who merely stand by and watch. Each one who offers himself must be on the field at a certain time every day, must stop smoking,—perhaps he only began yesterday,—must stop drinking, and, in fact, put an end to all those villanies that have not yet been born, but for whose arrival preparations are being made by their mother, the devil.

Order and regularity is the first principle of the team. The trainer insists upon this, and the candidate does not object, because it is a point of honor with him to do his best in the defence of the larger honor of his col-

lege. He can do his studying, if he wishes, at any time during the day, except for the pair of hours in the afternoon. He may be put off the team at an early date, but he has the opportunity of joining others, and in any case he has had a little suggestion of something respected by his mates much more than the perpetration of some outlandish prank. The two are not very different from one another, except that one is permitted by the community and the other may be—and probably is—contrary to civil and moral law. They serve, however, precisely the same purpose as far as the perpetrator is concerned. They are both the overflow of this new sense of freedom, of naturally buoyant spirits that can be turned into athletic sports as easily as into cards or something worse.

Much of the danger at a university can be traced to its source in the need of wholesome recreation and exercise. It is not the exercise that detracts from study, but the inaction which detracts from both. College morality in a large sense is a thing maligned. The few who do not see fit to put themselves under its protection furnish the material for gossip and journalism which both of these estimable mediums for spreading news credit to the entire university. The morality there is not a perfect thing, but, without detracting from the respect that is justly given our honored parents, it is infinitely better than it was thirty years ago, and "progress is better than perfection."

Close upon the restraint enforced by the training comes that which is the first essential of education, and which has justly been said to be next to godliness. After two hours of strong, vigorous exercise come a hot and cold bath, a "rub-down" with all sorts of healthy liniments, and a phenomenal dinner of soup, roast beef, potatoes, and custard pudding: what could be a better preparation for morality and health and success? It may be too much for a year, too strong exercise for the heat of spring and summer, but three months of it can easily add twenty pounds to a young man's weight and 10 per cent. to his examination marks, and finally—let us be conservative—at least 50 per cent. to his manly self-respect and his ability to reason with clear common-sense on whatever comes before him. One needs but to step into the dining-room of the team or into the huge shower-baths of the gymnasium to see that human manners and human morals are being straightened day by day as well as human bodies. Those whose allowance from the parental exchequer is large must forego fancy dinners and indigestible concoctions, liquid or otherwise; those who know of no parental exchequer are under a like necessity of eating a stunning meal three times a day. Far be it from me to taboo a mellow pipe after dinner or a glass of mellower Burgundy. Many a hard-worked brain playing at foot-ball with the world finds infinite solace in these relaxations. They have their admirable uses; but where they serve no other purpose than that of firebrand to start the flame, it is fortunate that in some cases they can be withheld for a time.

Then, too, the game, in conjunction with others, has a small education in it that would, if they were compared, equal several much more dignified occupations and revered studies. It is a peculiar game, familiar no doubt, or should be, to all; for though at every instant during the hour and a half required to play it out there is the same repetition of a scrimmage, yet the instant the ball is again in motion, and the twenty-two men are started after it, the field is in a situation it has never been in before. Signals there are, schemes piled upon schemes, tricks, feints, and rules that are with difficulty followed or totally disregarded; but the history of each play is unique; it

has never been known before. Active thinking, self-reliance, power to carry out what is attempted, and ability to decide at once and in the right way—these are not qualities to be disregarded, nor is any training that tends to perfect them.

All this causes a smile on the part of the reader as giving a little too much importance to a small thing. But though studies and their accessory employments constitute the bulk of college work, they often fail to educate certain necessary qualities and habits of mind that less important matters force into a student's character—qualities that do not come from much reading of books. It eventually appears, therefore, that the smile is one of ignorance, or of knowledge based on newspapers for text-books. Anything that gives men training in good directions is not a proper subject for ridicule. The mere fact that athletics are now a part of the college work, that faculties appoint committees to guide and properly restrain them, is evidence of a recognized importance.

The great trouble, however, at home and abroad, with the game of foot-ball is in its *brutality* (the word has been so abused that it deserves to be put in italics). Here is another point on which journalism has called up all that could be found in the dictionary and elsewhere to help it condemn and at the same time highly color the sport. The newspaper "story" must be a bright, readable account, free from dull detail, and it takes advantage of the extraordinary amount of scratches, which cannot be avoided in a personal contest, to give that spice to its narrative that is demanded by the delicate palate of the American reading public. Yet even this has come to be a story of the past now.

Injuries, however slight, are less frequent than ever, and in the more important games of the last season there is scarcely an instance of rough, brutal, or unfair play. As for accidents, there is an important distinction to be made in estimating them—the distinction between very slight and serious injuries. In an admirable report prepared by a committee appointed for that purpose in 1888 at Harvard University, it appeared from replies sent in by 1,016 students that 912 had received no injuries at all, that 88 had been hurt once, 13 twice, and 3 three times. Of these 104 accidents, 42 resulted from foot-ball, in which 165 students practised regularly every day during two months and about 200 more played games occasionally. Out of the 42 accidents 35 were slight and amounted to nothing. Consequently, seven men supplied the material which filled the newspapers with the brutal details of injuries for nearly two months; nothing being said of the injuries received in other sports.

That is, the accidents in foot-ball are almost entirely such as result from any sport where human beings come in contact with each other, and the serious injuries there are not more common than in daily life. Nor are those that do occur more lasting than or so much to be regretted as some of the moral and mental injuries that the game helps to prevent. On the other hand, the moral brutality supposed to be called up by this contest is still more of a myth.

Men do lose their tempers,—not so much as they did, however,—but such carelessness is in direct violation of rule and is disobedience, and it is punished with discharge. There can be no better school for the cultivation of self-control than one in which the test is so severe as it is here. Fifteen years ago, before systematic training was introduced, foot-ball, like other sports, consisted largely in personal strength and the ability of one man to

knock down half a dozen others. There were then numerous instances of fighting on the field, and these created the material for criticism which has done much to injure the sport and is only now beginning to disappear. At present the increasing skill in playing the game makes it necessary that each of the eleven men work with his comrades to accomplish a single move, and the day of the individual player has gone by. The game, doubtless, is still rough; the players are handled without delicacy; but if a boy cannot learn to control himself here and stand up for his own, it will go hard with him when he tries to stand up against the world outside. He has his friends about him here and knows he is sure of support. In the other fight he may be sadly in want of them.

Friends are, indeed, valuable property, and perhaps the chief benefit a young freshman, new to his college and to his fellow collegians, finds in his first year at college is in the friends he chooses. The sports bring him before his fellows, and thus widen the circle of his acquaintances and his opportunity for choosing valuable friends. Some of our fathers, themselves of the great universities, send their hopeful heirs to small colleges because of their fear of these acquaintances, because of their fear of many things they saw in their own day, and finally because of athletics. Small colleges do their good work; but they are like small cities—they do not give you all that is to be had. They turn out great men, but it is not they who make them great. A larger university is only a smaller world; it has all the good and most of the bad qualities of its greater model, and is a good school for that reason alone. It is not the fault of the college that the boy goes wrong, and its size has but little influence one way or the other. How many sins are shifted to the shoulders of some of our great-hearted alma maters!

The boy learns strange things there, as he will elsewhere, but the somewhat stern training that comes to him only through athletics, the systematic life for a few months in the year, the honest friendships made by standing shoulder to shoulder against a common rival, all give him a habit of picking well from his newly-acquired knowledge and of relying on himself; and we can only regret that the training is not more moderate and of longer duration.

It is not a perfect school—far from it; but it puts a little chivalry into a man and gives him an inkling of systematic habits. Let him go his own way, then; play foot-ball hard if he can—it is better than hard dissipation or anything else of the sort; give him the maternal benediction that has no equal, the assurance that woman is holy always, that every man has his good side, that a reasonable amount of modesty is commendable, and that—well, that there are other good points as well, too numerous to mention.

JOSEPH HAMBLEN SEARS.

DO AMERICANS LOVE MONEY?

A FIXED idea in the European mind is that Americans are incurably enamored of money; that they pass their lives in pursuit of it, and that they care for very little else. When this idea has reached the populace, it is perverted into the belief that every American is rich, and that riches may be had here almost for the asking. The perversion is not much further from the truth than the original idea; but it is easy for us to see how both the one and the other may be credited abroad.

All things are relative. There is so much more money in the new world;

it is so much more distributed and so much more easily made than in the old world that it seems there to be as plenty here as vegetation. And being so comparatively plenty, Europeans, who value it far beyond what we do, naturally think our desire for it excessive and insatiable. They ascribe to us, in short, the feelings they would have under our circumstances.

We are continually lectured by our British kinsmen, often as meddlesome as they are pharisaical, on our frenzied haste after wealth, and the evil result thereof; while their Continental neighbors echo them in still more dolorous strains. That we strive harder for and bestow far more thought on money than the mass of Europeans is at once conceded. People do not occupy time in trying to get what they know is not to be had. The Laplanders waste no days in laboring to cultivate fruit, nor the Singhalese in seeking snow. For the same reason the great majority of Europeans make no efforts to gain riches, of which they have, indeed, but an abstract notion. Absorbed in earning the scantiest livelihood, they are content with that. They are without ambition or enterprise,—these terms are not in their vocabulary,—being fully satisfied to follow the humble paths trodden by their ancestors for generations. Any sort of surplus is not only beyond their reach, but beyond their hope. It appears to them, if it appears at all, like the visions of the saints or the dawn of the millennium.

Our Country is a new country in more than one sense; it generates new ideas, new hopes, new aspirations; it evolves new destinies for the race. Its citizens feel that all the rewards of life are within their reach; that they can, if they will, lift themselves from poverty to fortune. But only a few prize financial success, or understand how it may be attained. But that it is attainable, that it is possible, is an honor to the Republic and a proof of our democracy. The name of Commonwealth has, with us, a fresh significance, is an additional incentive to exertion.

The old world learns of the millions heaped up here in an incredibly short time by gigantic undertakings, bold speculation, brilliant financiering. Our own newspapers delight to record and exaggerate the monetary achievements of the day. It really seems as if the nation were engaged in a colossal crusade after wealth, as if the whole population were embarked in the pursuit of it, reckless of the means employed. But it is solely seeming. Even here, in the land of plenty and promise, most of us remain poor, and go to our graves without an effort to secure other than a modest competence, which is a duty—and yet generally neglected—we owe to ourselves and those dependent on us. As a people we distinctly do not love money. The exact reverse of the widespread opinion of the national love of money is really true.

Daily examples, within the circles of our individual observation, denote this. Money is superabundant. Any one may get it, in moderation, if he cares to. It is not properly appreciated; it is too plentiful to be valued. It comes easily, and goes easily. It slips through our fingers—how, when, or where, we are not concerned to know. We constantly disregard financial opportunities; we live monetarily to-day, taking no heed of the morrow.

Do we love money? What we love we want to keep, to increase, to monopolize; not to spend, to waste, to share, as the average American does with such sums as fall to his lot. If we loved money, we should guard it zealously; add to it with watchfulness, toil, and pains; strike furiously at him who would aim to deprive us of the least portion. Is this our dispo-

sition or our habit? Are we inclined to hoard? Hoarding is an old-world custom, which we do not sympathize with or understand. Foreigners, when they come to our shores, are apt to relinquish the custom; for liberality is in the air. They cease to be anxious to augment what is to be had on every hand, what is accounted of minor importance. A native miser of the true breed is seldom heard of, is almost a contradiction in terms. Misers here, when discoverable, are found to be of alien blood, and governed by trans-Atlantic influences.

Americans, some of them, unquestionably love to make money. They enjoy the excitement of pursuit, the frequent difficulty of its procurement in vast amounts, the pleasure of management, manipulation, and successful outcome. They relish the game rather than its stakes, the power they exercise rather than the possession. But they are scarcely representative. They are, as a rule, the born money-makers, exceptional everywhere. They have a genius for their vocation, which is irrepressible, and is strengthened by indulgence. It is perfectly natural that they should obey their instincts; follow the bent of their minds, the drift of their being. Even without offered prizes, they would catch the scent, and run with the hounds. It is in their blood, and in harmony with their temperament.

But this disposition hardly springs from a love of money—very different from a love of making it. After money has been acquired, to whatever extent, it does not satisfy these fortune-chasers, who continue the chase for the sake of the chase. It is of these that we are always hearing. Their performances are rehearsed and repeated in hyperbolic phrase, orally and in print, until they appear to be a direct outgrowth of the Country and examples of its mercenariness.

Europe takes them up, declares them to be veritable types of our people, and significant of the coming decline of the Republic. Such homilies as they occasion at home and abroad would be tiresome if they were not so overpitched as to be diverting. They always speak of this inappeasable appetite for gain as if it were a moral disease indigenous to the United States and produced by popular institutions. They seldom concede that it is largely due to the energy, the restlessness, the keen perception, the mental alertness, the passion for success, the delight in achievement, which are among the features of Western civilization. They neglect to say that these money-makers are equally money-spenders, that squandering is as pleasurable as winning. Such an admission would show what has been asserted, that the desire for acquisition entirely outweighs greed.

Americans who embark in big enterprises, who take great financial risks, and are lucky in them, generally sustain heavy losses again and again, and, oftener than not, are reduced to poverty. The fearless and prosperous operators of a few years ago have already passed out of sight, and others have come in their stead, and will always be coming. There is a regular succession in every prominent city of triumphs and defeats in every commercial field.

Wall Street and the Produce Exchange bear witness to this. The monetary leaders seldom last. They coruscate for a while, and then their final spark goes out. In a hundred markets, all over the land, one may meet men who have been millionaires, and are now bankrupts. They may be millionaires once more. Rarely, unless very old, do they surrender hope or ambition. They silently watch the wheel, expecting that it may yet come round again. If it does not, they are silent also. If you grow intimate with

them, they may repeat a chapter here and there of their unwritten biography as an illustration of the way the world goes, and smile as they recount it. They have had experience, ever valuable, they will say, and have learned certain lessons in life, which is sufficient compensation, in the absence of any other.

Commend us to the pure American for calmness and philosophy, under crucial circumstances! He is at base a stoic. Stoicism is his rational and national religion.

Foreign critics are lost in wonderment at the resignation of our people to sudden change of fortune, so common here as barely to attract notice. They admit that we slip from wealth to ruin without depression or complaint. Where Europeans would go mad, or commit suicide, we gather up the fragments and resolve to try again. We turn from the darkness of the night to the radiance of the unborn day, and feel stronger for what we have endured.

This is the best evidence that we have no love of money as money; that we are fond of making it for the employment it furnishes to the active brain and the industrious body; that, having lost it, we are ready and eager to stand up, and have another tussle with fortune, and, if need be, stil. another and another. We have any number of examples of men who have spent half a dozen times their inherited or acquired riches, and, at their last spending, have not repined.

There is scarcely a record of an American of unadulterated stock who has been a murderer from pecuniary motive. If we want money, we get it in dramatic fashion; in quaint, pictorial style. Making millions is our way of dealing practically with the romance that lurks in our fervid souls. We are generous to a fault, extravagant, prodigal,—what you will; but in regard to love of money we are so inconstant as to argue ourselves unworthy and incapable of such love.

JUNIUS HENRI BROWNE.

THE POOR MAN AT HARVARD.

THE representative spirit at Harvard is a high and manly one, notwithstanding the numerous statements and the current belief to the contrary. The fast set is limited in number, and the set of snobs, though numerous, is smaller than is generally believed. Harvard is a little world in itself, where young men of all kinds of character and ability have come together ostensibly for the training which the college offers them. Some work only for the degree which is offered for four years of successful work, and a few do not seem to care even for that. While it is the common belief that Harvard is a college for the rich, I have no hesitancy in stating that the majority of students have at their command a very limited allowance, either because of the wisdom of their parents or because of actual poverty.

The really poor man naturally does much studying, for he has an object in view, and, since his money is hard earned, he tries in every way to get the utmost possible return from its expenditure. Usually such men have ability, and this, added to their earnestness, guarantees them a leading place among the scholars of the college. Yet among the class of men in moderate circumstances there are men of equal ability and earnestness, and since they have not the worry which the poorer men have, it is often to them that the

plums of scholarship fall. In many ways it is an advantage to be a poor man here, because it gives earnestness where otherwise it might not be found; but no man can do his best work in college when he is forced to give much of his time to outside work for self-support.

There are some curious sentiments at Harvard, particularly among freshmen and sophomores, and even among those seniors and juniors who retain sophomore and freshman characteristics. One of these is the desire to be considered "a man of the world"—a spirit which has brought much unmerited discredit to the Harvard student as a type. Another is the contempt with which he looks upon the "grind," or the man who studies hard and conscientiously.

The typical "grind" is a most undesirable fellow. He pores over his books from morning till night, and far into the night; he takes no notice of matters of common interest or of college affairs; he talks only about books and studies; he is a crank; and he is appropriately represented in the college comic paper as a man with long hair and a vacant, far-away, poetical expression, and his constant companion is a book. Some look at him with contempt, and the majority with pity, for it is doubtful if any one ever knew a real out-and-out "grind" to be a marked success in life.

It is certainly not a wonder that a man does not wish to be considered one of these; but here, as elsewhere, the student goes to excess. The snobs began the custom of ridiculing the "grind," and then of extending their ridicule to all hard students; and now, among this class, every man who works hard is considered a "grind." The sentiment has unfortunately spread through the college, and finds expressien very often from men who in all other affairs cannot be called snobs. It is an unhealthy sentiment, and one which should have no place here, for it is a sign of snobbishness which may bring to Harvard a very unsavory reputation.

The grinds are almost always poor men. They have to work hard, they have to wear poor clothes, and, being poor, they are obliged to keep aloof from their fellow students. They are, however, typical only of a very small class, and all poor men and hard workers should not be judged by them. The majority of the poor men at Harvard are able men, of manly and noble disposition, of genial nature, and with practical minds. They differ from many of the leaders in college life only in that they have already been forced to find a purpose in life because they have been thrown on their own resources. They are prematurely advanced, or, as is often the case, are really older in years, as well as in thought, than the majority of college men.

As to how many men there are in Harvard who are dependent on their own resources for self-support there are no statistics at hand upon which to base a statement. Probably there are very few, perhaps not more than a score, who are absolutely dependent on themselves; but there are many more who are in large measure forced to support themselves. A cheap dining-hall recently started by one of the most philanthropic members of the faculty now boards about one hundred and fifty men, nearly all of whom are forced to live with great economy; and these are only a part of the poor men at college, for some live in Cambridge, others go home to the neighboring towns, and many board at other places. Probably there are two hundred men in college, or nearly one-fifth of the total number, who in one way or another help support themselves.

These men come from all parts of the country and from all walks of life. The sons of professional men, of tradesmen, mechanics, and farmers, are all

here among the poor men. Either inspired by their parents or finding the inspiration in themselves alone, they have chosen to seek an education, and, seeing the importance of their step and the value of improving every opportunity, they are an earnest body of students of whom the world will hear more in the future. Generally they are older than the average student, and sometimes they are full-grown men.

It is a boast of the college that no worthy needy student who would profit in life by a college degree need leave Harvard for want of money, and the experience of the poor men amply justifies this statement. There are few places where money can be spent more easily than here, and there is perhaps no other educational institution where money can be more easily obtained.

Directly from the college aid may be obtained in various ways. One hundred and twenty-five scholarships, yielding in the aggregate some $28,000, are annually given away to needy students. For those who are not successful in obtaining these there is now a fund of $15,000 annually available, which is distributed, in sums ranging from $100 to $250, to deserving students.

Besides these, there are loan funds and prizes. One of the chief sources of income, however, is outside work. The majority of the faculty take a deep interest in deserving, self-supporting students, and through them not only is profitable employment secured for the summer months, but much college and other work is turned over to them during term time. One of the most profitable sources of income is tutoring. Unfortunately for them, though fortunately for the poor man, there are many men at Harvard who have more money than they know what to do with, and in spending it they find less time for study than is expected of them. When the examinations by which they are to be tested come, they find need for outside aid, and they then go to some needy student who ranks high, paying him from two to three dollars an hour for his services as tutor. Some men have earned from this source alone more money than they needed to meet their year's expenses, and many men each year add materially to their income from this source. Not a few students write for the press.

The poor man at Harvard is socially a failure, but mentally a success. Sometimes he enters athletics, but the majority, either from choice or necessity, keep aloof from this source of pleasure but destroyer of time. He is not openly snubbed by his more fortunate fellow students, but finds himself more or less an outcast, though few probably desire or try for the companionship of those with whom they cannot keep pace if they would. In nearly every member of the faculty he finds a warm sympathizer and supporter; and the encouragement which he receives from this source gives to him an increased desire for work and for success.

To the class of poor men I have belonged for four years full of toil, yet full of pleasure. I have not found it necessary to give all my time to study and work, but have profited somewhat from what is perhaps the most valuable part of a college training—the general college life, the meeting of people of all types, and the choosing of friends from among them. Yet this has been of necessity a secondary feature of my college life, and though my hair is not longer than it should be, nor my sole topic of conversation Homeric or Darwinian, I have still been a hard student, and with the snobs have the reputation of being

A "GRIND."

MY GOLD CURE.

THE fall and death of Colonel John F. Mines, while producing a great shock on account of his prominence in literary circles and as an advocate of the Keeley cure, as well as the gallant fight he seemed to make against his disease, cannot affect the public appreciation of my discovery, except among those whose only information on the subject was derived from his article in the October number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Of the 700 patients now at Dwight under treatment, not 5 per cent. are there through any other agency than their own personal knowledge of cures, ranging from one to ten years. The fact that friends and neighbors have received the Keeley treatment and secured, as far as human knowledge can estimate, permanent and lasting cures is the convincing argument. The Keeley cure has advanced slowly, without advertisement except that of cured men, from one patient, twelve years ago, till now the average attendance is as above. About the beginning of the present year the Chicago *Tribune*, after thorough investigation, opened its columns to ex-patients for the relation of their personal experiences, and thus succeeded in attracting the attention of the literary world and placing information as to the cure and the institution in the minds of the reading public. This information, taken advantage of, has now placed cured men in almost every city, town, and hamlet in the United States, as well as many foreign countries. The indubitable evidences of these cures remain and will always be monuments of my discovery, making the Keeley institutes the Meccas of the liquor and opium habitués.

Colonel Mines came to Dwight a physical and mental wreck. Being a man of brilliant intellect and great variability, his nervous system, even in its normal state, was subject to the greatest mutations, going from the state of highest enthusiasm to one of deepest dejection in an incredibly short time. In many cases the action of narcotics so masks the symptoms of other affections that it is not till the patient is freed from them and their impression that an intelligent diagnosis can be made. In Colonel Mines's case, after progressing partially through the treatment, the suspicion of paresis was aroused and much solicitude caused to me for fear that an unusually magnificent mind was to be permanently lost to the world. That solicitude caused me to keep up a regular correspondence with the patient, and as late as September 20 Colonel Mines wrote to me in Paris in such extravagant terms of his cure, betraying such an emotional state, that I was more fearful than ever of progressing nervous disease. When landing from the steamer in New York I looked in vain for Colonel Mines's face among the crowd on the dock, and it was not till the next day, when a mutual friend called, that I obtained any knowledge of him. This friend said he had met Colonel Mines a few days before and was afraid he had gone wrong. He had acted like one under the influence of drugs, suggestive of either hydrate of chloral or sulfonal, or a mixture of both. I sent out a gentleman familiar with Colonel Mines's habits and haunts, seeking him high and low, as long as I remained in New York, and it was not until I reached Chicago that I learned of the pitiable end of my brilliant patient.

The friend who met him described his condition as one of deep dejection and melancholy. Evidently his mercurial temperament had been subjected to one of those terrible reactions or reverses that he was so prone to, and he had resorted to some drug to overcome the depression, and, being easily and dangerously impressed by it, was really insane at the time. It will probably

never be known what the causes were that brought about his fall, but the conclusion to be made is that, with his temperament and environment, a lasting cure was not to be effected. He was, in fact, one of the 5 per cent. of patients that could not be permanently cured. On second thought, those familiar with Col. Mines's writings, or who had enjoyed his personal acquaintance, can but acknowledge that this sad occurrence will not impede or retard the grand work of which he wrote so brilliantly. The members of the various bi-chloride of gold clubs, formed by ex-patients in many localities, for the purpose of continuing the acquaintanceship formed at Dwight and branch institutes, crystallizing their labors in behalf of other unfortunates, and collecting interesting information regarding the ex-patients, claim that the percentage of cures is actually above the 95 per cent. that I credit to my remedy. The club at Dwight, with a membership of seventeen hundred in regular communication with its secretary, places the failures at less than 3 per cent. The Chicago club, with a membership of over four hundred, has had but six failures, being only 1½ per cent. The latter club's membership is wholly within the city and is therefore reliable in its statistics. How can one failure impede the work, lessen the value of the discovery, or discourage the friends of the unfortunates?

The world is to-day absolutely without any other remedy approaching this in success; the accumulated mass of testimony admits of no reasonable doubt as to its claims, and the daily demonstration of its efficiency at Dwight on the seven hundred patients and the patients at the twenty-six branches should deservedly have the confidence and support of the afflicted ones and their friends. The following letter, written after a year's experience of the cure, is self-explanatory:

"CHICAGO, Ill., Oct. 16, 1891.

"GEORGE B. SMITH, ESQ, secretary Bi-chloride of Gold Club, Dwight, Ill.

"DEAR SIR: Since talking with you a few weeks since I am impressed with the propriety of submitting to the club on the anniversary of my graduation from the Keeley Institute at Dwight, which occurs October 22, 1891, a letter in grateful acknowledgement of the benefits and advantages I have personally derived from the treatment and cure. Feeling assured that my past twelve months' experience must be worth something to the membership now with you, I beg to submit the following, which are the practical results of the year just closed: Twelve months ago my condition had reached a stage of the severest extremity. I was in the great city of Chicago, without money and without friends. The generous assistance of my family was speedily consumed in drink, and the clothing supplied was pawned as soon as received. I was without shelter and without an article of wearing apparel which would bring the price of a drink; I was without aim, energy, or purpose. I was ignorant of the simplest business forms. I had never held a position of any description for six months; I was more dependent than a child. I lived by the generosity of family and friends, whose confidence I always betrayed. I was without moral stamina; my health was wrecked; I would submit to insult and abuse for a drink of whiskey. Twice, for a term of six months each, had I been sent to the best inebriate asylums of the land. I had travelled the world pretty much over in the hope of my people that change would effect a cure, but nothing made head against the monstrous disease which had me in its death-grip. This was my condition twelve months ago, when I commenced Dr. Keeley's treatment. Now for the result. This is what warms my heart and gives me courage to

betray the humiliating experience of the past. It is the animating hope that good may come of it.

"The day after my treatment was finished I was taken into a large jobbing house in Chicago. I was taken by men who knew my past and were willing to take the risk of giving me a trial. They afforded me an opportunity of learning their intricate business. I commenced as a workman in the stock. In four months I was advanced to the position of travelling salesman, since which time other promotions have followed. Now, what is this worth? Since Dr. Keeley pronounced me cured I have been an independent citizen, able to work and glad of the opportunity. I believe I have earned the confidence and esteem of my employers, and their frequent letters of commendation seem to attest as much. I have made money enough to meet all present wants and enough to apply a considerable sum to the payment of old debts, and have not contracted an additional obligation. The transformation of my own life is still to me a marvel. I can scarcely comprehend the change. Twelve months passed, and not only have I not touched a drop of any intoxicating thing whatsoever, but I have not had the first desire to drink. There has been no fight, no struggle. I am frequently asked how I withstood the temptations of the 'road.' There are no temptations; there is no desire. Appetite is gone; but I take no risks. I have no desire to test my strength. It has proved sufficient. What more do I want? Think of absolute freedom for twelve months from the awful craving of a diseased appetite. Think of the ability to do for one's self and for others. Think of health restored, with appetite only for food and ability to sleep. Think of the family who have suffered deeper sorrow than sorrow for the dead. Think of character restored till living is a delight and not a curse. Think of happiness, prosperity, and peace. Oh, it is a resurrection indeed. This is a practical experience. Yet there are those who condemn Dr. Keeley and his treatment without investigation. In my humble judgment, from the standpoint of my own experience, I say the man who deters others who suffer from the disease of alcoholism from applying the means of rescue which Dr. Keeley offers has taken a grave responsibility upon his soul. Let him look to it. Dr. Keeley cured me nothwithstanding my skepticism and lack of faith. To him all credit is due. May I not hope you will some time write your own wonderful experience as you told it to me? Fraternally, ALBERT E. HYDE."

LESLIE E. KEELEY.

JEWISH SOLDIERS IN THE UNION ARMY.

AS A Union soldier I feel compelled to take exception to a part of Isaac Besht Bendavid's reply to Goldwin Smith. I refer to that portion of his article in the September number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW relative to the service of Jews in the Union armies. He cites, in particular, the military merit of Generals Lyon and Rosecrans. Of General Lyon I will only say that it must prove a genuine surprise to his many friends in Connecticut (his native State) to see him set down as a Jew. In all human probability this is the first time such a claim has been presented to their notice. In regard to General Rosecrans, he was sent to West Point at an age too young to have developed any very pronounced ideas of race, and, being educated by the government, could have had no other feeling of nationality than that symbolized in the flag that waved above his youthful studies. That he fought

for that flag when it was imperilled was simply doing what he was required to do—what he made oath to do in order to obtain admittance to the Military Academy. He was from a loyal State, and had no excuse of "State rights" to justify desertion. In religion General Rosecrans was a Catholic, and he celebrated high mass in Chattanooga over its salvation—saved by the consummate ability, the magnificent fighting, the heroic endurance, of that glorious hero, George H. Thomas! In view of all these facts, it is somewhat difficult to comprehend how General Rosecrans can be considered as a real Jew.

As to the Jews "standing shoulder to shoulder with their fellow citizens":

I had served in the field about eighteen months before being permanently disabled in action, and was quite familiar with several regiments; was then transferred to two different recruiting stations; but I cannot recall meeting one Jew in uniform or hearing of any Jewish soldier. After the war, for twenty-five years I was constantly engaged in travelling, always among old soldiers, but never found any who remembered serving with Jews. Indeed, this was so marked as often to become a subject of comment. I learned of no place where they stood "shoulder to shoulder," except in General Sherman's department, and he promptly ordered them out of it for speculating in cotton and conveying information to the Confederates. If so many Jews fought so bravely for their adopted country, surely their champion ought to be able to give the names of the regiments they condescended to accept service in. For we know from the Hebrew scriptures that the children of Abraham were terrible warriors, and must regret not being able to enlist a few modern Samsons.

J. M. ROGERS.

INDEX

TO THE

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD VOLUME.

OF THE

North American Review.

Actress, Reflections of an, 329.
ADAM, JULIETTE. Are French Novels Faithful to Life? 536.
ADAMS, O. F. "Our Dreadful American Manners," 375.
ADLER, HERMANN. Russian Barbarities and Their Apologist, 513.
Affections, Dogs and Their, 312.
A "GRIND." The Poor Man at Harvard, 756.
American Manners, Our Dreadful, 375.
Americans, Do They Love Money? 753.
Americans, What They Can Do for Russia, 596.
Amœboid, The Human, 636.
Anecdotes of English Clergymen, 304.
Anglo-Saxons, Are We? 253.
"Apolleia"—A Prophecy, 506.
Are French Novels Faithful to Life? 536.
Are We Anglo-Saxons? 253.
Arithmetic and the Baccarat Case, 507.
ARITHMETICIAN. Arithmetic and the Baccarat Case, 507.
Art of Magic, The, 92.

Baccarat Case, Arithmetic and the, 507.
Barbarities, Russian and Their Apologist, 513.
BARR, AMELIA E. The Relations of Literature to Society, 87.
Basis of Belief, The Scientific, 181.
Belief, The Scientific Basis of, 181.
BENDAVID, ISAAC BESHT. Goldwin Smith and the Jews, 257.
Benefits of War, The, 672.
BERNER, H. E. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 747.
BISHOP, CHARLES F. How to Improve Municipal Government, 588.
BRIGGS, CHARLES A. The Theological Crisis, 99.
BRISSON, HENRI. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 738.
BROWNE, JUNIUS HENRI. Selfishness as a Preservative, 118; The Value of Vanity, 379; Do Americans Love Money? 753.
BRYCE, JAMES. Thoughts on the Negro Problem, 641.
Business Prospects, Our, 559.

Canada, "Reciprocity" and, 468.
Can Lying Be Justified? 115.
Can We Make Rain? 385.
CARPENTER, ELON N. Is Drunkenness Curable? 360.
CHIAVASSA, A. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 748.
Chile and Her Civil War, 405.
China, New Life in, 420.
Civil War, Chile and Her, 405.
Clergymen, English, Anecdotes of, 304.
Colleges, English Universities and, 67.
Coming Glacial Age, The, 640.
COMSTOCK, ANTHONY. Vampire Literature, 160.
Consolidation, A Plea for Railway, 272.
Coöperation, Industrial and Financial, 79.
Coöperative Womanhood in the State, 283.
Corporal Punishment, Is It Degrading? 693.
Crisis, The Theological, 99.
CRISPI, EX-PRIME MINISTER. Italy and the Pope, 620, 704.
CROTHERS, T. D. Is Drunkenness Curable? 352.
CUMMINS, ELLA S. Can Lying Be Justified? 115.
Curable, Drunkenness Is, 442.

DANA, CHARLES A. The War—Some Unpublished History, 240.
DAVIDSON, ROBERT C. How to Improve Municipal Government, 585.
Debts, Public and Private, 610.
DE FREITAS, RODRIGUES. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 746.
DE HIRSCH, BARON. My Views on Philanthropy, 1.
DILKE, EMILIA F. S. Trades-Unions for Women, 227.
Discontent, The Farmers', 5.
Do Americans Love Money? 753.
Dogs and Their Affections, 312.
Domestic Service in England, 23.
DOUGLASS, FREDERICK. Haïti and the United States, 337, 450.
Drunkenness Is Curable, 442.
Drunkenness, Is It Curable? 346.
Dumb, To Women Not, 117.
DYRENFORTH, ROBERT G. Can We Make It Rain? 385.

EATON, CHARLES H. The Ideal Sunday, 322.
EATON, DORMAN B. A New Variety of Mugwump, 44.
Economic Man, The, 491.
EDSON, CYRUS. Is Drunkenness Curable? 368.
Electricity and Life, 378.
ELY, RICHARD T. The Inheritance of Property, 54.
England, Domestic Service in, 23.
English Clergymen, Anecdotes of, 304.
English Politics, Women in, 568.

English Universities and Colleges, 67.
European Legislatures, The Quorum in, 737.
Evolution of the Yacht, The, 432.
Exploit, A Famous Naval, 296.

Failure of the Jury System, The, 246.
FAITHFULL, EMILY. Domestic Service in England, 23.
Fallacy of Patriotism, The, 509.
Famous Naval Exploit, A, 296.
Farmer on Top, The, 13.
Farmers' Discontent, The, 5.
FLEMING, JOHN C. Are We Anglo-Saxons? 253.
Foot-ball: Sport and Training, 750.
Freaks of Law, 504.
FREEMAN, EDWARD A. English Universities and Colleges, 67.
Free Silver, A Plea for, 524.
French Novels, Are They Faithful to Life? 536.
Future of Marriage, The, 126.

Glacial Age, The Coming, 640.
GODKIN, E. L. "The Economic Man," 491.
Gold Cure, My, 759.
Goldwin Smith and the Jews, 257.
GRACE, WALTER J. Harnessing the Rain-Cloud, 252; The Coming Glacial Age, 640.
"Greater New York," 250.
Great Statistical Investigation, A, 684.
GREGORY, ROBERT. Is Corporal Punishment Degrading? 693.

Haïti and the United States, 337, 450.
HALSTED, L. B. Possibilities of Washington Society, 634.
HAMMOND, WILLIAM A. How to Rest, 215; Is Drunkenness Curable? 346.
Harnessing the Rain-Cloud, 252.
HART, THOMAS N. How to Improve Municipal Government, 580.
Harvard, The Poor Man at, 756.
HEATON, JOHN L. The Future of Marriage, 126.
HERRESHOFF, LEWIS. Possibilities of the Steam Yacht, 172; The Evolution of the Yacht, 432.
HERRMANN, A. The Art of Magic, 92.
History, Some Unpublished, of the War, 240.
HÖGSBRO, SOFUS. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 744.
How to Improve Municipal Government, 580.
How to Rest, 215.
Human Amœboid, The, 636.
HUNTINGTON, C. P. A Plea for Railway Consolidation, 272.
HURLBERT, WILLIAM HENRY. "Reciprocity" and Canada, 468.
HUTCHINSON, B. P. Speculation in Wheat, 414.

Ideal Sunday, The, 322.
Ideal University, The, 381.
Immoral Teacher, The State as an, 193.
Industrial and Financial Coöperation, 79.
INGERSOLL, ROBERT G. The Three Philanthropists, 661.
Inheritance of Property, The, 54.
Investigation, A Great Statistical, 684.
Is Corporal Punishment Degrading? 693.
Is Drunkenness Curable? 346.
Italy and the Pope, 620, 704.

JACKSON, EDWARD P. Weeping Pugilists, 123; A Terrible Possibility, 249; Electricity and Life, 378; "Apolleia"—A Prophecy, 506; The Human Amœboid, 636.
James Russell Lowell, 460.
Jewish Question, New Light on the, 129.
Jewish Soldiers in the Union Army, 761.
Jews, Goldwin Smith and the, 257.
Jury System, The Failure of the, 246.

KEELEY, LESLIE E. My Gold Cure, 759.

Laboring, Loafing and, 32.
Lack of Good Servants, The, 546.
Law, Freaks of, 504.
LEEDOM, JAMES. The Fallacy of Patriotism, 509.
Life, Electricity and, 378.
Life in China, New, 420.
Light on the Jewish Question, New, 129.
Literature, The Relations of, to Society, 87.
Literature, Vampire, 160.
LIVERMORE, MARY A. Coöperative Womanhood in the State, 283.
Loafing and Laboring, 32.
Lowell, James Russell, 460.
LUCE, S. B. The Benefits of War, 672.
Lying, Can It Be Justified? 115.

Magic, The Art of, 92.
Manners, Our Dreadful American, 375.
Manœuvres, The Value of Naval, 144.
Man, The Economic, 491.
Marriage, The Future of, 126.
MCCARTHY, JUSTIN. Women in English Politics, 568.
MÉLINE, JULES. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 741.
Middle-Aged Women, 121.
MILLER, JOHN. The Ideal University, 381.
MINES, JOHN F. Drunkenness Is Curable, 442.
Money, Do Americans Love? 753.
MORRIS, CLARA. Reflections of an Actress, 329.
Mugwump, A New Variety of, 44.
Municipal Government, How to Improve, 580.
My Gold Cure, 759.
My Views on Philanthropy, 1.

Naval Exploit, A Famous, 296.
Naval Manœuvres, The Value of, 144.
Negro Problem, Thoughts on the, 641.
NEWCOMB, SIMON. Can We Make It Rain? 398.
New Life in China, 420.
New Light on the Jewish Question, 129.
New Political Party, The, 220.
New York, Greater, 250.
NOONAN, EDWARD A. How to Improve Municipal Government, 591.
Novels, French, Are They Faithful to Life? 536.

OUIDA. The State as an Immoral Teacher, 193; Dogs and Their Affections, 312.
Our Business Prospects, 559.
"Our Dreadful American Manners," 375.

PALMER, EMERSON. "Greater New York," 250.
Party, The New Political, 220.
Patriotism, Pensions and, 205.
Patriotism, The Fallacy of, 509.

PENNOYER, SYLVESTER. The New Political Party, 220.
Pensions and Patriotism, 205.
Philanthropists, The Three, 661.
Philanthropy, My Views on, 1.
Plea for Free Silver, A, 524.
Plea for Railway Consolidation, A, 272.
Political Party, The New, 220.
Politics, English, Women in, 568.
POLK, L. L. The Farmers' Discontent, 5.
Poor Man at Harvard, The, 756.
Pope, Italy and the, 620, 704.
PORTER, DAVID D. A Famous Naval Exploit, 296.
PORTER, HORACE. Railway Rates, 718.
PORTER, ROBERT P. Public and Private Debts, 610.
Possibilities of the Steam Yacht, 172.
Possibilities of Washington Society, 634.
Possibility, A Terrible, 249.
POWDERLY, T. V. The Workingman and Free Silver, 728.
Preservative, Selfishness as a, 118.
Private Debts, Public and, 610.
Property, The Inheritance of, 54.
Prospects, Our Business, 559.
Public and Private Debts, 610.
Pugilists, Weeping, 123.
Punishment, Corporal, Is It Degrading? 693.

Quorum in European Legislatures, The, 737.

Railway Consolidation, A Plea for, 272.
Railway Rates, 718.
Rain, Can We Make It? 385.
Rain-Cloud, Harnessing the, 252.
RAUM, GREEN B. Pensions and Patriotism, 205.
"Reciprocity" and Canada, 468.
Reflections of an Actress, 329.
Relations of Literature to Society, The, 87.
Rest, How to, 215.
ROGERS, J. M. Jewish Soldiers in the Union Army, 761.
RUCHONNET, LOUIS. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 742.
Russian Barbarities and Their Apologist, 513.
Russia, No Starvation in, 638.
Russia, What Americans Can Do for, 596.

SANTA CRUZ, JOSE M^A. Chile and Her Civil War, 405.
Scientific Basis of Belief, The, 181.
SEARS, JOSEPH HAMBLEN. Foot-ball: Sport and Training, 750.
Selfishness as a Preservative, 118.
SERGIUS V. No Starvation in Russia, 638.
Servants, The Lack of Good, 546.
SHERWOOD, M. E. W. The Lack of Good Servants, 546.
Silver, A Plea for Free, 524.
Silver, Free, The Workingman and, 728.
SMITH, CHARLES STEWART. Our Business Prospects, 559.
SMITH, GOLDWIN. New Light on the Jewish Question, 129.
Society, The Relations of Literature to, 87.
Society, Washington, Possibilities of, 634.
SOLEY, JAMES R. The Value of Naval Manœuvres, 144.
Some Unpublished History of the War, 240.
Speculation in Wheat, 414.
STANTON, THEODORE. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 737.
Starvation in Russia, No, 638.
State as an Immoral Teacher, The, 193.
State, Coöperative Womanhood in the, 283.
Statistical Investigation, A Great, 684.
Steam Yacht, Possibilities of the, 172.
STEPNIAK. What Americans Can Do for Russia, 596.
STEVENSON, E. IRENÆUS. To Women Not Dumb, 117.
STODDARD, RICHARD HENRY. James Russell Lowell, 460.
Straws, 481.
Sunday, The Ideal, 322.

Teacher, The State as an Immoral, 193.
Terrible Possibility, A, 249.
THATCHER, CHARLES A. The Failure of the Jury System, 246.
"The Economic Man," 491.
Theological Crisis, The, 99.
Thoughts on the Negro Problem, 641.
Three Philanthropists, The, 661.
THURBER, F. B. Industrial and Financial Coöperation, 79.
THURSTON, R. H. The Scientific Basis of Belief, 181.
To Women Not Dumb, 117.
Trades-Unions for Women, 227.
TUCKERMAN, CHARLES K. Anecdotes of English Clergymen, 304.

Union Army, Jewish Soldiers in the, 761.
United States, Haïti and the, 337, 450.
Universities and Colleges, English, 67.
University, The Ideal, 381.
Unpublished History of the War, Some, 240.

Value of Naval Manœuvres, The, 144.
Value of Vanity, The, 379.
Vampire Literature, 160.
VAN BLOHLE, BEERLAERTS. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 745.
Vanity, The Value of, 379.
Views on Philanthropy, My, 1.
VOORHEES, D. W. A Plea for Free Silver, 524.

War, The Benefits of, 672.
War, The—Some Unpublished History of, 240.
Washington Society, Possibilities of, 634.
WATTERSON, HENRY. Straws, 481.
Weeping Pugilists, 123.
WELLS, KATE GANNETT. Middle-Aged Women, 121; Freaks of Law, 504.
What Americans Can Do for Russia, 596.
Wheat, Speculation in, 414.
WHIPPLE, E. P. Loafing and Laboring, 32.
WIJK, OLOF. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 748.
WILSON, DANIEL. The Quorum in European Legislatures, 739.
WIMAN, ERASTUS. The Farmer on Top, 13.
Womanhood in the State, Coöperative, 283.
Women in English Politics, 568.
Women, Middle-Aged, 121.
Women Not Dumb, To, 117.
Women, Trades-Unions for, 227.
Workingman and Free Silver, The, 728.
WRIGHT, CARROLL D. A Great Statistical Investigation, 684.

Yacht, Possibilities of the Steam, 172.
Yacht, The Evolution of the, 432.
YOUNG, JOHN RUSSELL. New Life in China, 420.

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

Mar 17 1914